DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 191 95 SO 009 662

AUTHOR	Haas, John D.
TITLE	The Era of the New Social Studies.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, Boulder, Colo.; Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SSEC-194
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	103p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302 (Order SSEC Publication No. 194, $4.00 paper cover)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Development; *Educational History; Educational Innovation; Educational Philosophy; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Progressive Education; Social Sciences; *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*New Social Studies

ABSTRACT

Tracing from 1955 to the present, the author presents an objective analysis of the new social studies movement which has had great impact on the theory and practice of social studies education. Beginning in 1955 a general attack on public education critiqued the content and methods of instruction on such subjects as reading, foreign languages, mathematics, and science. Alarmed at the launching of the Russian Sputnik I, critics pointed with alarm at the shortcomings of American education. Briefly discussing the advancements in science and mathematics, the author focuses his attention on the beginning of the revolution in social studies, discussing the changes in the conceptual foundations of social sciences and the government funded curriculum materials projects. Although the movement waned from 1968 to 1972, three new trends have emerged: a heightened social consciousness, increased concern for values and valuing, and usage of a variety of classroom media and materials. The author notes in retrospect that social studies education today again seems to be looking for a focus and suggests a renewal of the dialogue and debate concerning definition, scope, and sequence to add impetus for social studies educators to rediscover and reclarify their positions. (Author/JR)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED141191

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ERA OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

by

John D. Haas

John D. Haas is Professor of Education at University of Colorado in Boulder, Colorado.

SP009662

Published jointly by:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, Boulder, Colorado, and

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colorado.

1977

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Council for the Social Studies for critical review and determination of professional competence. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Council for the Social Studies or the National Institute of Education.

ORDERING INFORMATION

This publication is available from:

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(ORDER SSEC PUBLICATION NO. 194)

It is also listed in *Resources in Education* and can be obtained in microfiche and hard copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, identified as SO 009 662. See *Resources in Education* for ordering information and ED number.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface....iii

Background of the New Social Studies....1
The Critics: From Flesch to the Council on Basic Education....2
Sputnik Fever....7
The Conant Report....8
The Trump Plan....9
Curriculum Reform in Mathematics and Science....10
The Woods Hole Conference....15

Beginning of the Revolution in Social Studies....18
Two Pioneers: Senesh and Fenton....20
Conceptual Foundations of the New Social Studies....22
The NCSS/ACLS Papers....23
The Stanford Conference....26
The Syracuse Conference....34
Impending Reform....35

The Heart of the Movement: Curriculum Materials Projects....38
Launching the New Social Studies Projects....38
Concerns, Cautions, and Forebodings....41
Early Efforts in Teacher Education....44
Informing the Profession....46
Early Critiques of the NSS Projects....50

The Height of the Movement....51
Continuity and Change in Social Studies Education....51
The Projects and Inservice Education....54
The First Published Products....57
The Continuing Critique....58
The Rude Intrusions....63
The Zenith of the NSS Movement....64
A Second Wave of NSS Projects....66

Outcomes....70
Appraisals of the NSS Projects....70
Emerging Trends in Social Studies: 1968 to 1972....73
The 1971 NCSS Curriculum Guidelines....77
The NSS Movement Withers....78
Perspectives on the Movement....79

References....85

Related Readings in the ERIC System....95

PREFACE

Over the past two decades a remarkable phenomenon has occurred in American education: substantial, if not massive, participation of the federal government in education, particularly at the precollege level. While the federal government has long played some role in education, such as keeping educational statistics and partially supporting land-grant colleges, it has not previously engaged in substantial efforts to shape the content and methodology of teaching. Now such an effort has been launched, and is not likely to cease, although the directions it will take are varied and unpredictable, if the experience of the last 20 years is an indication.

An important part of the activities inspired in large part by the increased availability of federal funds was a thrust that came to be known as "the new social studies." Resources much greater than had previously been available were used for a variety of curriculum development and teacher education activities. A "movement" that at first focused primarily on the content and methodology of the social sciences and later went off in great variety of directions rose, flourished, and faded--at least as far as the original emphases are concerned.

Much can be learned, of success and failure, of promise and needed cautions, by reviewing such a phenomenon. John Haas has executed such a review, in masterful style. He has identified the origins, described the major actors and accomplishments, presented new insights, and drawn useful conclusions of "the new social studies." His paper should be of great interest to students and teachers of social studies and the social sciences, whether they viewed these efforts as promise of a great new future or as a fad from which education could and would recover.

Irving Morrissett
Director, ERIC Clearinghouse for
Social Studies/Social Science
Education, and
Executive Director, Social Science
Education Consortium

THE ERA OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

by

John D. Haas

> All social movements involve conflicts which are reflected intellectually in controversies. It would not be a sign of health if such an important social interest as education were not also an arena of struggles, practical and theoretical. (Dewey 1939, p.v)

Background of the New Social Studies

An historical era is like a comet--entering the visicn of an earth observer as a mere speck in a universe of specks, then appearing to move with increasing acceleration across an arc of the night sky, and finally disappearing in a flight of evanescence. Where and when the comet seemed first to appear are obviously dependent on where the earth observer is standing, on how keen is the observer's eyesight, on whether or not the observer is using a telescope, on the accuracy of the timing device used, and on the comet's intensity and proximity to earth.

The comet, on the other hand, follows its inexorable path, oblivious to planet earth and its observer species. The comet is neither present nor gone; it merely is; it exists in a process of becoming and dying.

Like the comet and its paradoxical relationship to the human observer, a sequence of human events observed by one of the participants in those events presents a similar problem of determining what occurred. How does one describe the inscrutable past, especially the recent past in which one was an actor? How does one determine what is relevant evidence from the myriad survivals, from that sparse yet unmanageably huge collection of historical data? How does one recall and bring to consciousness those experiences that may help to illuminate the objective facts? Where does one begin? Unlike the comet, one must choose in order to know.

As the novelist Joseph Heller knew that somewhere, sometime "something happened," we also know that beginning some twenty years ago a distinguishable movement in public education began. A national curriculum

reform thrust emerged from the bitter debate that focused on the content of schooling. As is usual in the history of public education in the United States, a bombardment of critiques became the catalyst for liberating the energy necessary to effect change.

The Critics: From Flesch to the Council on Basic Education

In tracing the era of the "New Social Studies" curriculum reform movement, it is difficult to determine when precisely this era began. Since the popular media (television, newspapers, periodicals, and trade books) served as the forum for debate (for critiques and responses), a logical choice for a beginning date is the year 1955. During this year the "great debate" attained its height of ferocity. The attack on public education was led by the author of the popular 1955 best-seller, *Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It*. In the first chapter, taking the form of "A Letter to Johnny's Mother," Rudolf Flesch summarized his impressionistic tour of United States schools:

> What I found is absolutely fantastic. The teaching of reading--all over the United States, in all the schools, in all the textbooks--is totally wrong and flies in the face of all logic and common sense. Johnny couldn't read until half a year ago for the simple reason that nobody ever showed him how. Johnny's only problem was that he was unfortunately exposed to an ordinary American school. (Flesch 1955, p. 9)

Reading was only the visible tip of the iceberg. In the same year, Douglas Bush, in *The New York Times Magazine*, wrote that "one thing that has suffered grievously and conspicuously in this last generation has been the study of foreign languages. The usual reason given is again the pressure of numbers, the numbers who are not going beyond high school, but again a positive reason has been open or quiet hostility." Then came the vicious attack: "Serious study of a foreign language means work, and a first principle of modern pedagogy has been the elimination of work" (Bush 1955).

After spending the fall of 1955 in the U.S.S.R., Senator William Benton was much impressed with Soviet schools and had this to say in April 1956:

> My recent trip to the U.S.S.R. suggests that the Soviet educational system can prove to be the good news of damnation for American education--the spur which may rouse us and propel

> us toward salvation. If so, this will sustain Arnold Toynbee's thesis that the competition provided by the Soviet system will force us to live up to our own great ideals. . . . I have seen for myself the vast technocratic Sparta that is burgeoning. . . . I have talked to the topmost Soviet educators. I returned convinced that Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods, may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs or guided missiles to deliver them. . . .
>
> Russian youngsters today to go school six days a week, and more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours do. Discipline is strict, study hours are long, the curriculum is demanding, and examinations are severe. At all levels the Soviet students, like European students in general, work much harder than do our American youngsters. (*New York Times Magazine* 1956)

Benton was impressed by the Russian ten-year school, where, during the last six years, students spend more than 40% of their time in science and mathematics. He asserted that "the contrast with our American secondary school curriculum is startling." Of primary concern to Benton was the waste of talent he perceived in United States public education and the national need for scientists and engineers and for teachers of science and mathematics. He observed that in 1954 the U.S. produced only 125 new teachers of physics for the 28,000 high schools in the nation, and that only 23,000 engineers were graduated as compared to a demand for 45,000 to 50,000 new engineers per year (and compared to 53,000 new engineers in the U.S.S.R. for the same year).

There were many facets to the critique of public education in the United States in 1955. In the domain of the school curriculum (that is, the content and methods of instruction), the attack focused on the subjects of reading, foreign languages, mathematics, and science, and on the teaching methods advocated in the ideologies of "progressive education" and "life adjustment education."

The ideological debate was initiated, with a few notable exceptions (for example, Rudolf Flesch), from outside the educational establishment (that is, public school teachers, school administrators, and professors of education), by journalists, intellectuals, and university professors in the humanities and sciences, and by a few national politicians. For the most part, again with a few exceptions, the members of the education establishment were the defenders of the "successes" of the public schools,

while the journalists, intellectuals, and professors of the arts and sciences were the critics and provocateurs, and, significantly, they were also the protagonists having the readiest access to the popular media.

A prominent protagonist in this great debate was the University of Illinois historian, Arthur E. Bestor, Jr. In 1953 Bestor authored the stylistic and devasting polemic, *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*. The argument presented by Bestor followed these lines: The public schools in the United States no longer value the high calling to train students' minds in the intellectual disciplines and in the power to think. The reasons for this "retreat from learning" are 1) the naive faith of Americans in the schools, juxtaposed with a distrust of the results of intellectualism, and 2) the perpetuation of anti-intellectualism in the schools by the educational establishment, which is an interlocking directorate composed of professors of education, local school administrators (superintendents and principals), and bureaucrats in state departments of public instruction and in the United States Office of Education. Instead of advocating a classical curriculum composed of the "pure" academic (intellectual) disciplines such as history, physics, chemistry, and mathematics, the educational establishment has abandoned these disciplines in favor of broad fields such as science and social studies. An academic discipline is a way of thinking, a conceptual whole, a method of making meaning of facts; while the psuedo-subjects (for example, social studies) are mere aggregations of facts culled from a group of disciplines (Bestor 1953).

Two years later, in 1955, Bestor reaffirmed his position and suggested how America might restore learning to the public education enterprise. In *The Restoration of Learning: A Program for Redeeming the Unfulfilled Promise of American Education,* Bestor proposed to restore to prominence the academic disciplines; advocated the virtual abolition of departments, schools, and colleges of education; and favored ability grouping, tracking and, where feasible, separate schools for the academically talented and gifted. He also urged the nation to adopt or adapt the best intellectual aspects of European educational systems. Significantly, Bestor called for scholars to become involved in protecting the integrity of their disciplines as these subjects are taught in the schools (Bestor 1955).

Other equally vociferous voices added to the clamor for a return to the basics, to the trivium and quadrivium in modern dress. Some wrote books for popular consumption: for example, Mortimer B. Smith, *The Diminished Mind: A Story of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools* and Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Smith 1954) (Lynd 1953). Others inundated with articles the popular national newspapers, such as *The New York Times* and *The Wall Street Journal* and national periodicals, such as *Saturday Review, Reader's Digest, Ladies Home Journal, Life, Scientific Monthly, New Republic,* and *Time*.*

Another event of 1955 symbolized the end of one era in the history of education in the United States and the beginning of a new era. July 1955 marked the demise of the Progressive Education Association (PEA). For four decades, the leaders of the PEA had also been the leaders in American education. No longer would the education community respond enthusiastically to the names and ideas of Boyd Bode, George Counts, John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg, Edward Thorndike, and Carleton Washburne. For the remainder of the 1950s, and throughout most of the 60's, the powerful voices would be those of Benjamin Bloom, Jerome Bruner, James Coleman, James Conant, John Goodlad, Charles Silberman, Lloyd Trump, and Jerrold Zacharias.

What could be observed, then, by the end of 1955, was a full-scale critique of public education in the United States along at least three related dimensions. One "front" focused on a perceived neglect of certain subjects in the curriculum: reading, mathematics, the physical sciences, and foreign languages. A second front, frequently overlapping the first front, might be termed the "failure by comparison" dimension, in which schooling in the United States was condemned for not at least equaling the accomplishments of education in the Soviet Union or in western European nations, particularly with respect to the training of scientists and engineers.

The third front was philosophical or ideological, and dealt primarily with issues of purpose, of the nature of learning, and of assumptions

---

*See collections of articles in C. Winfield Scott and Clyde M. Hill, *Public Education Under Criticism,* N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954; and C. Winfield Scott, Clyde M. Hill and Hobert W. Burns, *The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

regarding human nature. One chronicler of "the great debate" saw this group of critics as opposed to

> the too universal acceptance of pragmatic philosophy as a basis for educational planning; they are alarmed about some of the practices usually identified with progressive education. . . . But they are critical, too, of the way our teachers are educated and selected, and of the way school policy is made. They are convinced that a small group of professional educators have played too great a role in the determination of school policy to the exclusion of scholars from other fields and the general public. (Woodring 1957, p. 9)

The vehement criticism abated little in 1956. Throughout the period 1956-1959 the critics increased in number and the critiques were expanded to challenge more and more subject areas and other aspects of the nation's schools, such as organization and administration. But, it wasn't until 1960, when curricular reform efforts were well underway, that a tenuous consensus was reached on what directions the educational reform efforts should take.

On July 3rd, 1956, the Council for Basic Education (CBE) was organized in Washington, D.C., by an outstanding group of American intellectuals who shared the belief that the "schools exist to provide the essential skills of language, numbers, and orderly thought, and to transmit the intellectual, moral and aesthetic heritage of civilized man" (Smith 1966, p. 1). The house organ for CBE became the *CBE Bulletin*, published ten times a year. The two major aims of the *Bulletin* were: "1) to defend and expound the idea of the primacy of intellectual and moral development in the schools through strengthening the academic curriculum, and 2) to do this defending and expounding in a readable manner" (Smith 1966, p. 1).

During the decade 1956-1966 the *Bulletin* published articles, both critiques and proposals, on a wide variety of educational topics including, elementary education, reading, English, history and the social studies, Latin, mathematics, "the bright and the not so bright," education of teachers, accreditation, and professionalism (Smith 1966, "Table of Contents"). CBE members and *Bulletin* authors comprised an impressive array of talent, mobilized to combat the educational establishment and to suggest improvements in the public school curriculum. Among the charter members of CBE were Arthur Bestor, Crane Brinton, Louis Hacker, Sydney Harris,

Howard Mumford Jones, Alfred A. Knopf, James D. Koerner, Joseph Wood Krutch, Alan Nevins, Mortimer Smith (Executive Director of CBE and *Bulletin* editor), Mark Van Doren, Peter Viereck, and over twenty other notables.

Sputnik Fever

The barrage of criticism continued through 1956 and into 1957. Many CBE members aired their views in the *CBE Bulletin* or in the popular magazines where potential visibility was greater. Then, on October 4th, 1957, Russia successfully launched Sputnik I as Earth's second orbiting satellite (the Moon being the first). In both a real and a symbolic sense this feat was the culmination of the Copernican revolution. It was the beginning of a new perception of Earth as a *mere* spaceship, as a closed planetary system. In international relations, however, it placed the United States in second place among those nations vying for world status. The wounded pride of Americans was the initial impact, to be quickly succeeded by a feverish search for the causes of such a national debacle. As had occurred over 20 years earlier during the nadir of the Great Depression, the American education system was a convenient scapegoat.

With Sputnik I, the critics had new and potent evidence to point to and to use as visible justification of their philosophical positions. Admiral Rickover's analysis was illustrative and typical.

> It was difficult before Sputnik, to present the full picture of Russian successes in the realm of the intellect. There was little patience then in this country with anyone who told of areas where we were no longer supreme. Unpleasant facts were so unwelcome that it was actually risky to mention them.
>
> The powerful thrust of Sputnik's launching device did more than penetrate outer space. It also pierced the thick armor encasing our complacent faith in America's present and future technological supremacy....
>
> It did great damage to our trust in the American educational system. . . . Harsh words are being said about its methods no less than about its aims. Sputnik has been seen as a triumph of Russian education, and rightly so. (Rickover 1959, pp. 35-56, 157)

With few exceptions the critics, before and after Sputnik I, pointed with alarm at the shortcomings of American education and even gratuitously offered general programs for adoption by school boards, but they were not reformers with staying power, with the commitment needed to change curricula and practices. Though fine essayists and journalists, they were not the doers, the change agents, the strategists of achieving institutional response. As is true of polemicists in general, they lacked the patience so necessary to effect change. Also, since most of the critics were "outsiders," that is, not a part of the legitimized institutional framework of public education, they did not have access to the institutional mechanisms or levers of change.

By 1959, the purposes served most effectively by the critics were no longer necessary. The critics had raised the issues, had elevated the debate to national visibility and concern, and had mustered citizen agreement and support for change, even if the directions of change remained unclear or still lacked consensus. Even more importantly, for almost a decade the critics had sustained interest in the problems facing public education, until the human resources could be recruited and financial resources made available by foundations and federal legislation.

Paul Woodring saw clearly the difference between the role of the critic and that of the leader: "The sharp critics of education are at best effective catalysts rather than leaders on the new road" (Woodring 1957, p. 29). He also saw that the "new road" remained unmapped:

> Today we stand at the crossroads which Bode identified in 1938. Perhaps we have been standing there for the past twenty years, for educational thought has shown remarkably little advance in the past two decades. . . . New leadership will certainly emerge, and with it a new philosophy of education which will provide the basis for the education of the years ahead. The new philosophy will reestablish our link with the past without trying to return us to the past. . . . It must be a synthesis of the classic thesis in education with its antithesis, for neither of these alone offers a satisfactory solution to the problems facing us today. (Woodring 1957, pp. 29-30)

The Conant Report

There was no mention of James Bryant Conant or his study (Conant 1959) in the Woodring book: both books were published in 1959. As John

W. Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, wrote:

> On February 19, 1957, James Bryant Conant performed his final duties as United States Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. Ten days later he was absorbed in the initial stages of this history-making study of the American high school. (Gardner 1959, p. ix)

The "Conant Report" burst on the American educational scene in 1959 with little warning, yet its impact was startling. A leader had succeeded the critics, and he was greeted with almost messianic enthusiasm.

The appeal of Conant was a magical potion: an internationally prominent chemist, a former president of Harvard University, a former ambassador, a student of comparative education, and a consultant to the Manhattan project and to the Atomic Energy Commission. He took no note of the critics of the earlier 1950s. avoided pandering to any educational pressure groups, assuaged the fears brought on by Sputnik, glorified that American creation, the comprehensive high school, laid down a set of criteria by which a high school might be judged, specified a blueprint for excellence, and addressed his remarks "to interested citizens."

Conant did not pontificate; his report was practical and was based on first-hand observations in high schools throughout the United States. His recommendations were wide ranging, from the counseling system to ability grouping, from individualized programs to required programs for all students, from English composition to marketable vocational skills, from homerooms to summer school programs. For at least the next five years, Conant's prescriptions for a quality comprehensive high school were the standards against which school boards and administrators would judge their own high schools.

The Trump Plan

At the same time that Conant was emerging as an impetus to change, another leader in a somewhat different domain of education was also achieving recognition. In 1957, J. Lloyd Trump, on the Washington, D.C., staff of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, authored a booklet which suggested some new ways of organizing secondary

schools, especially with respect to deployment of teachers and students in ways other than one teacher and 30 students per class (Trump 1957).

Trump was in agreement with Conant that "no radical alteration in the basic pattern of American education is necessary in order to improve our public high schools (Conant 1959, p. 40). Conant emphasized "three requisites for the successful operation of a high school: *first*, a school board composed of intelligent, honest, devoted citizens. . . . *second*, a first-rate superintendent; *third*, a good principal" (Conant 1959, p. 38). Trump, in a book coauthored with Dorsey Baynham, emphasized the role of the principal as the instructional leader and change agent, and the ways teachers, students, and curriculum materials interact as crucial to student learning (Trump and Baynham 1963). As in the case of Conant's book, which became popularized as the "Conant Report," the Trump-Baynham book became known as the "Trump Plan."

The major changes Trump and Baynham advocated were: 1) team teaching, 2) differentiated staff patterns (master teachers, team leaders, teachers, and teacher aides), flexible scheduling of students, courses, and class time, and teacher assignments, and 3) a tripartite division of instructional/learning modes: large group instruction (20-30% of instructional time in a given course), small group instruction (40-60% of instructional time), and independent study (20-30%). A large group was defined as 30-300 students, whereas a small group would be 5-20 students. Since the Trump Plan appeared at the same time that the post-World War II baby boom was increasing secondary school enrollments, new junior and senior high school buildings could incorporate architectural features to accommodate the Trump concepts and practices.

Curriculum Reform in Mathematics and Science

If Conant and Trump were responsible for paving two new roads of educational reform which would guide change efforts throughout the first half-decade of the 1960s, a third road was being constructed at a far slower pace, beginning in the early 1950s. This was the tortuous task of creating new curriculum materials--new textbooks (not revisions), new non-textbook materials, and new audio-visual materials, in every broad field in the elementary and secondary school curricula.

The curriculum materials reform movement began, almost without notice, with the formation of the University of Illinois Committee on School Mathematics (UICSM) in 1951. In 1956, still prior to Sputnik, Jerrold Zacharias of MIT wrote a memorandum which led to the creation of the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC) (Silberman 1970, p. 168). As typified by UICSM and PSSC, the leadership in curriculum materials development efforts "was largely in the hands of university scholars concerned with the schools' failure to reflect and incorporate advances in knowledge" (Silberman 1970, p. 170).

UICSM and PSSC were initially concerned with the reform of college teaching of mathematics and physical science, but they quickly changed their focus to the pre-collegiate level, and specifically to college preparatory students and courses. Also, their first curriculum reform efforts were directed at the secondary school; only later did reformers in a broad field (for example, mathematics) turn to the more difficult challenges of the elementary school and of non-college-bound students. The tenor of the 1950s placed emphasis on excellence and the development of academically talented and gifted students.

UICSM, under the leadership of Max Beberman, emphasized "the structure of mathematics, learning mathematical principles through discovery, consistency, and precise terminology" (Sherman 1972, p. 12). These guidelines grew out of Beberman's analysis of the deficiencies of entering freshmen at the University of Illinois. The deficiencies were: "1) poor computational facility, 2) poor conceptual background, 3) ignorance of proof and structure except in geometry, and 4) ignorance of contemporary applications in natural science, social science, and technology" (Jones and Coxford 1970, p. 69).

The curriculum development rationale for mathematics education, that is, for the *new* mathematics, was argued in the following manner:

> Structure, proof, generalization, and abstraction were seen as the essence of modern mathematics. Emphasizing these ideas required precision and care in all mathematical statements. In teaching mathematics, then, these four essentials should be clearly evident to the learner because of their importance, but also for another reason. To make mathematics applicable the problem solver must perceive the structures inherent both in the application and in the

> mathematics to be used. From this viewpoint the first essential in applying mathematics is the perception of a mathematical structure or system that has abstract properties corresponding to the physical system's properties. Thus abstraction and application are not antithetical, but essential companions. Only if he understands the structures of mathematics and of the application can the user of mathematics choose a mathematical model whose structure most nearly satisfies the requirements of the problem situation. This conception implies that students well prepared in mathematical theory should be able to apply mathematics to completely novel situations with more facility than persons trained otherwise. (Jones and Coxford 1970, pp. 69-70)

Once need and a reform rationale had been articulated, UICSM began the arduous task of developing an entirely new high school mathematics program for grades 9-12. Not until 1958 were UICSM textbooks available for widespread purchase and use (*Analysis of New Mathematics* 1963, pp. 57-66).

The fact that seven years elapsed from the formation of UICSM to final publication is an indicator that more was involved than merely the writing of new textbooks. Beberman synthesized the extensive efforts of his team in a 1963 National Council of Teachers of Mathematics pamphlet:

> Our major concern has been with the development of instructional materials and their experimental trial in schools throughout the country. We have introduced some new content, rearranged some of the traditional content, and have developed many promising pedagogical techniques and approaches. To enable teachers to help us in the experimental trials of our teaching approaches, we have conducted summer training institutes which prepare teachers for the use of our materials. This training emphasizes both content and pedagogy.
>
> . . . Although we do not consider the present editions as experimental, we still recommend that they be used with caution and preferably only by teachers who have had an opportunity to study them under the supervision of a person who has had classroom experience in their use or who has made an intensive study of their content and the implicit pedogogy.
>
> The present textbooks of the UICSM comprise just one component of a teaching program. They are designed to be used by students whose teachers have access to the detailed commentaries which are part of the teacher's editions of the texts. The commentaries contain the fruits of a decade of research on the use of the texts in thousands of class-

> rooms. Suggestions are given for alternative approaches, for deletions or additions, and for procedures for adapting the materials to meet individual differences among students. The commentaries are kept up-to-date through the UICSM Newsletters which contain sample tests and articles on the handling of various topics in the textbooks.
>
> The fact that the present units are bound separately should not mislead the reviewer into regarding the units as independent textbooks. In fact, the units should be looked at as separate chapters of one book entitled *High School Mathematics*. The units were written to form a thoroughly integrated and sequential course. (*Analysis of New Mathematics*, 1963, pp. 57-58)

The UICSM project, over the duration of its existence, received grant funds first from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and later from the United States Office of Education (USOE) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). The PSSC project was the pioneer pilot curriculum project for NSF. Prior to PSSC funding in 1957, NSF, created by Congress in 1950, supported inservice institutes for secondary school science and mathematics teachers, but no materials development. During the next 15 years, two patterns of funding national projects were followed: 1) initial funding by private foundations (for example, Carnegie and Ford), followed by NSF or USOE support, and 2) long-term funding from start-up to publication by NSF or USOE.

From 1951 to 1957, six national projects in science or mathematics came into existence. Other than UICSM and PSSC, there were Boston College Mathematics Institute (starting date, 1957), the Madison Project (in mathematics; 1957), University of Maryland Mathematics Project (1957), and Survey of Recent East European Literature in School and College Mathematics (mainly developments in the U.S.S.R.; 1957) (Lockard 1975). From 1951 to 1955, however, only UICSM existed; in 1956 only UICSM and PSSC existed; and by 1956 six projects had been funded: four in mathematics, one in science, and one a survey of the literature in mathematics.

Yet by 1957 some broad assumptions of and guidelines for curricular reform had emerged from the four mathematics projects and one science project that then existed. These assumptions and guidelines would be accepted in general by virtually all succeeding nationally funded projects *in all subject areas* during the period 1957 to 1969. Those general

statements, with which Zacharias, Beberman and others would have agreed, are:

1) that there is a need to change the content, materials, and methods of instruction in the subject;

2) that the most crucial focus in improving instruction and learning is the student textbook or learning materials;

3) that directors of projects should be drawn from the academic disciplines, though teachers, school administrators, and education professors are acceptable as project staff members or consultants;

4) that the prestige of project sponsors and/or directors is crucial to legitimation of curriculum projects;

5) that curricular reform in particular subjects should begin where those subjects are manifested as discrete courses, that is, in the high school;

6) that the improvement of courses for the academically talented and gifted is more crucial to the national interest than general education courses;

7) that the integrity of the academic disciplines must be an overriding concern at all educational levels;

8) that the essense of a discipline of knowledge is in its structure, that is, in its models, theories, concepts, generalizations, methodologies, and applications;

9) that learning by discovery or inquiry enhances motivation and transfer of learning;

10) that the cognitive, intellectual dimension of learning is a more appropriate focus in schools than the affective and personal/social action dimensions;

11) that inservice education is necessary to effective use of new curriculum projects and should be balanced among new content, new pedogogy, and new materials;

12) that curriculum product development is an experimental process involving development of a rationale, deciding on format and learning sequence, writing segments, field-testing in schools, revising, producing teacher aids based on empirical classroom observations, diffusing product information, and publishing final products; and

13) that considerable time and money are required for curriculum product development.

In 1958 and 1959, the curriculum materials reform movement built in momentum, though still primarily in mathematics and science. Projects proliferated throughout the nation, made possible by increased allocations for curriculum materials development in the budgets of USOE and NSF. The directors of projects gradually emerged as a "new leadership" in American education, and project names were shortened to just their initials.

In 1958, the new projects were: School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG), Educational Services Incorporated (ESI) Arithmetic Project, Minnesota Mathematics Project (MINNEMATH), and Chemical Bond Approach (CBA). There were more new beginnings in 1959: Stanford University Sets and Numbers Project, Greater Cleveland Mathematics Program (GCMP), Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), Chemical Education Material Study (CHEM STUDY), and Elementary School Science Project (ESS).

The Woods Hole Conference

America's Educational landscape was changing. Seats of power and leadership were shifting: *from* the schools, state departments of education, and departments, schools, and colleges of education; *to* university scholars in the sciences and mathematics, and in psychology (Skinner and Bruner were influential); *to* research and development groups (ESI in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Educational Research Council of Greater Cleveland, and Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley, California); and *to* national agencies and foundations (USOE and NSF; Carnegie and Ford).

New talent and new money were made available to promote change in America's schools and especially to produce new curriculum materials and to retrain teachers. NSF began promoting retraining in 1953 and materials development in 1957. Through various of its bureaus and programs (for example, the Cooperative Research Program), USOE funded curriculum projects and, with the passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, provided funds for summer institutes and later for academic year experienced and prospective teacher fellowship programs. The Carnegie and Ford foundations redirected their funds toward education, especially for conferences, for writing position papers, and for the start-up of curriculum projects.

In celebration of their recent elevation to prominence, education's new elite met at Woods Hole on Cape Cod, in September of 1959. The conference represented the consolidation of the movement, the conceptualization of the new principles of curriculum development, and the recognition of the founders' contributions. Although fewer than 40 participants were present, their influence was destined to affect national curriculum development projects for a decade.

The "sense of the meeting" was reported by that participant who would become the intellectual giant of the movement, Jerome Bruner (Bruner 1960). A Harvard cognitive psychologist, Bruner was but one of the many luminaries who were present at Woods Hole: Richard Alpert of Harvard, Edward Begle of Yale, Lee Cronbach of Illinois, John H. Fischer of Teacher's College, Columbia University, Robert M. Gagné of Princeton, H. Bentley Glass of Johns Hopkins, Barbel Inhelder from Geneva, Switzerland, David Page of Illinois, and Jerrold Zacharias of MIT were some of the others. The groups sponsoring or funding the conference were also among the prestigious and powerful agencies in the United States: National Academy of Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Carnegie Corporation of New York, U.S. Air Force, Rand Corporation, USOE, and NSF.

Bruner summarized not only the conference, but also the experience of the pioneers in mathematics and science curriculum materials development, the status of epistemology (especially the philosophy of science), and current thinking in cognitive and developmental psychology. These strands were stylistically woven into a multicolored, multilayered fabric whose patterns could be readily perceived and understood by almost any reader. A few excerpts reveal the colors and patterns (Bruner 1960):

> --Virtually all of the evidence of the last two decades on the nature of learning and transfer has indicated that, while the original theory of formal discipline was poorly stated in terms of training of faculties, it is indeed a fact that massive general transfer can be achieved by appropriate learning, even to the degree that learning properly under optimum conditions leads one to "learn how to learn." (p. 6)

> --Mastery of the fundamental ideas of a field involves not only the grasping of general principles, but also the development of an attitude toward learning and inquiry,

> toward guessing and hunches, toward the possibility of solving problems on one's own. (p. 20)
>
> --Intellectual activity anywhere is the same, whether at the frontier of knowledge or in a third-grade classroom. . . . The schoolboy learning physics *is* a physicist, and it is easier for him to learn physics behaving like a physicist than doing something else. (p. 14)
>
> --Various people who have worked on curricula in science and mathematics have urged that it is possible to present the fundamental structure of a discipline in such a way as to preserve some of the exciting sequences that lead a student to discover for himself. (p. 20)
>
> --We begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development. (p. 33)

The *Process of Education* was later summarized and further simplified by reviewers and commentators. Robert McClure was one summarizer of this classic volume:

> Four basic themes emerged from the ten-day conference: structure, readiness, intuition, and motivation. Discussions of structure were based on the premise that knowledge acquired without a comprehensive framework to tie it together is likely to be forgotten. Readiness was considered in the context of a resurrected and reemphasized interest in the work of Piaget and other developmentalists in the attempt to effect a sequential progression that would pair intellectual offerings with the developing skills of the learning child. Conferees explored the possibility of teaching intuition as a learned skill through classroom reinforcement of "good guessing" and other supportive teaching devices. Discussions on motivation included some old concerns, e.g., the nature of interest and how can teachers generate a pervasive sense of excitement that will far outlast the teaching tools that arouse it, and examined some new ones, e.g., the threat that television and the new technology will result in a generation of passive students who, overentertained at home and overexcited in the classroom, will sit back like an audience waiting for the curtain to go up.
>
> . . . Woods Hole was important not because it produced new knowledge, but rather because it legitimized the curricular examinations of the fifties (and before) and provided a theoretical basis for and a transition to the work of the sixties. (McClure 1971, pp. 54-55)

Beginning of the Revolution in Social Studies

A small part of the curriculum materials development work of the sixties came to be called the "New Social Studies." None of its leaders were unfamiliar with the Bruner volume, and Bruner himself became a part of the movement with his involvement in the Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) project.

Little hint of the onset of the "New Social Studies" (NSS) can be found in writings of the 1950s. One of the most eloquent spokesman in the field of social studies education, Earl S. Johnson, speculated on the future of the social studies in the 1958 yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (Johnson 1958, pp. 218-247). He saw very little imminent change in social studies curriculum and devoted his essay to the education of teachers. Change in social studies teacher education would occur, but much later, as a by-product of the reform of curriculum materials and primarily in inservice education rather than preservice education.

The first clarion call for a revolution in the social studies came in 1961, when an article by Charles R. Keller, Director of the John Hays Fellows Program, appeared in *Saturday Review*. Keller's article is significant in at least two respects: the author was a former college professor of history and Director of the Advanced Placement Program, and the article first appeared in a popular periodical rather than a professional journal. These two aspects also characterized the critiques in science and mathematics, which led to the curriculum revision movements of the "new science" and "new math."

The substance of Keller's plea was that:

> 1) In mathematics, science, English, and the foreign languages, the curriculum is being revised, improved, and brought up to date, but things are relatively quiet on the social studies front, where, perhaps, the need for revision is greatest.
>
> 2) In part, the present unhappy situation results from the fact that "social studies" is not a subject. It is a group or federation of subjects: history, geography, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology, often merged in inexact and confusing ways. Furthermore, too many social studies teachers have emphasized the creation of good citizens rather than the content and discipline of the subjects.

> 3) [What currently exists] was recommended in the 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies, and since that time there has been little change in the curriculum although the United States and the world have moved considerably since 1916.
>
> 4) Articulation. . . is particularly inadequate in the social studies. American history, for instance, is taught in survey courses in grades five, eight and eleven--and again in college--with practically no consultation or coordination of work among teachers.
>
> 5) It remains now to make suggestions for change, for a possible revolution in the social studies.
>
> We should begin by eliminating the term "social studies," which is vague, murky, and too all-inclusive and substitute for it the term "history and the social sciences," which is exact and hence meaningful. . . .
>
> "What do we want history and the social sciences to do in the educational process?" is a question that must be asked and answered. . . .
>
> . . . Attitudes cannot be taught in formal classroom situations. . . . What students should do in schools is to study subjects and become acquainted with facts and ideas. Subjects as such have disciplines that will help to develop students' minds. Students should learn how to think and to understand. They should know how historians and social scientists go about their work. Then, hopefully, they will develop democratic attitudes for themselves; then, hopefully, they will become good citizens. . . .
>
> . . . [The] curriculum begins with courses that capture student interest through exciting action in exciting places. It then moves to courses in which the conceptual rather than the fact-by-fact approach is employed and the unique structure of subjects is stressed. Students will learn how historians and social scientists go about their work. . . . The emphasis should be on learning and discovery rather than teaching, and on analysis, critical thinking, and interpretation. . . .
>
> . . . The "sheepskin curtain" which has been rung down between schools and colleges must be pierced. (Keller 1961, pp. 60-62)

Such lengthy excerpts from the Keller article are necessary in order to point out those strands of the "new social studies" movement which would prevail for over a decade, beginning in the early 1960s and continuing through the early 1970s, and which were clearly envisioned by Keller in 1961. Those strands, among others which came into play later on in the NSS movement, were:

1) that there is a need to revise, improve, and up-date social studies curriculum;

2) that change efforts should be focused on the separate academic disciplines of history and the social sciences;

3) that the content of the curriculum should be derived from the structure, concepts, and methodology of each academic discipline contained in the cluster, history and the social sciences;

4) that curriculum revision should ignore affective goals and promote cognitive or intellectual purposes of education;

5) that students should be taught how historians and social scientists create new knowledge; and

6) that new alliances between school teachers and scholars in history and the social sciences should be fostered and, by implication, that the influence of school administrators and college education professors should be reduced.

Momentum built along these lines in the period 1961 to 1963, both in terms of supportive literature and in the funding of curriculum materials development projects.

Two Pioneers: Senesh and Fenton

There were at least two pioneers, however, whose labors in the 195s anticipated the major thrusts of the NSS movement. Both were scholars in academic disciplines, one in economics and the other in history.

> Since 1958, he has worked at Elkhart [Indiana] two and three days a week--driving ninety miles each way, teaching teachers and taking over classes to learn and then to demonstrate what can be done. . . . The magnificent honesty of the Elkhart program is essentially the creation of Lawrence Senesh himself, a short, stout, toughminded, enthusiastic Hungarian with long gray hair and endless energy. (Mayer 1962, pp. 83, 84)

From his position in the department of economics at Purdue University, Professor Senesh reached across the abyss between elementary school and university campus to bring the essence of economics to children in the first, second, and third grades.

Senesh had initial support for his Elkhart endeavors from the school district central office, later from an Elkhart businessman, and then, prior to publication of the first edition of the *Our Working World* elementary school social studies textbook series, development money was provided by the publisher, Science Research Associates. Martin Mayer concluded that

> the good proportion of success in Elkhart schools--and all fourteen elementary schools are involved in the Senesh program--is a tribute to Senesh's imagination and intellectual fierceness, and to his control over what is done, a control given to him willingly by teachers who feel their own powers rising with the power of effective teaching ideas. (Mayer 1962, p. 84)

The unlikely habitat of Pittsburgh's Carnegie Institute of Technology (now Carnegie-Mellon University) was the professional residence of the Harvard-educated historian, Edwin Fenton. From his post in the history department, Fenton had been given responsibility for the preservice teacher education of secondary school history teachers--only a handful each year. As a model to his students, Fenton secured permission from the Pittsburgh Public Schools and the administration of Taylor-Allderdice High School to teach one section of a history course each school year to academically talented youth. This "laboratory" not only served as an observation post for Carnegie Tech's prospective high school history teachers, but also provided a testing ground for Fenton's own ideas on the content and pedagogy of history education.

Fenton was bothered by the pat narrative assertions common to the secondary historical source writing found in history textbooks. Also, he had experienced in his own teaching the students' boredom with and loathing of history and social studies courses. To bring life to history, to make it more problematical to students, and hence to rekindle student curiosity, he introduced primary source documents to students as the raw data from which history is created. Since raw data lie unanalyzed, uncombined, and mute before the historian, he must bring conceptual frames, evidential rules, and, most importantly, bothersome questions to bear on the assembled data, in order to create meaning from randomness and disorder. Out of Fenton's experiences with using primary source documents in his high school history class came the publication, *32 Problems in World History* (Fenton 1964).

As early exemplars of the NSS movement, Senesh and Fenton provided some clear directions and precedents:

1) The initiative in bridging the chasm between school and university was taken by professors in the disciplines of history and the social sciences.

2) The curriculum reformer gains credibility with potential clients by actually implementing his ideas in classrooms where he is a "demonstration teacher."

3) Although funds are needed for full-scale curriculum materials development, little or no money is needed to get started.

4) In seeking where to begin, the prospective reformer can find no better location than "his own backyard."

5) The initial, visible, obvious focus for curriculum revision is the course textbook.

6) The intellectual acumen, enthusiasm, and charisma of the change agent enhance the diffusion and adoption of innovations.

7) The test of the usefulness, effectiveness, and appeal of new curriculum materials is in the place where they are to be used--the classroom.

8) The nature of knowledge (the structure of economics or history) provides the initial, primary impetus for revision of the materials of instruction.

Conceptual Foundations of the New Social Studies

While Senesh and Fenton were feeling their way in what was for them a relatively new arena of professional activity, an intellectual infrastructure for the NSS was gradually taking form. In addition to the Bruner report of the Woods Hole conference, there were other works specific to social studies education which formed building blocks for the NSS movement. These dealt with the overarching conceptions of the nature of truth and knowledge, especially as represented by the discrete academic disciplines; with the structures of history and the social sciences; with the spirit and process of scientific and intellectual inquiry; with discovery, intuitive, cognitive, and conceptual learning theories; and with the characteristics and formats of non-didactic, heuristic curriculum materials and teaching methods.

As early as 1958, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) recognized that at least two trends were emerging: 1) infiltration of the social studies curriculum by previously neglected social sciences, including anthropology, economics, social psychology, and sociology; and

2) new ways of viewing knowledge in the disciplines of geography, history, and political science, as well as in the other social sciences (Price 1958). Also in 1958, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), a federation of organizations which represents the humanities and the humanistic social sciences, established a Committee on the Secondary Schools in order to alert scholars to the needs of the schools. To achieve this purpose, ACLS sponsored a series of panel discussion conferences on the problems and needs of secondary school curricula (ACLS/NCSS 1962).

The NCSS/ACLS Papers. Then, in 1960, NCSS and ACLS joined forces to sponsor a series of papers on the "content objectives" of each of seven social sciences and two other pepers on regional studies. Each statement was prepared by an eminent scholar in the discipline; the statement on history, for example, was prepared by Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton University. Prior to publication, most of the essays were presented and discussed at two separate meetings: one at Indiana University in Spring 1961 and the other at an annual national convention of NCSS in November 1961. When finally published in 1962, the work had the added prestige of a "Forward" by Gordon Turner of ACLS, an "Introduction" by Bernard Berelson of the Population Council, and an "Afterword: Revising the Social Studies" by Lewis Paul Todd of NCSS (ACLS/NCSS 1962).

Berelson stated the case for the need for revision of the social studies curriculum:

> To begin with, the need for detailed reconsideration of the social studies curriculum in the secondary school appears to be so clear that it hardly requires extended argument. Although the social studies is a sizable segment of the total, at the present time it is the only major segment not under systematic inquiry and development. In the past few years, the offerings in mathematics, in physics, in chemistry, in biology, in English, have all been put under intensive scrutiny. In most cases, revised programs not only have been put forward but have been put into effect. As for the importance of the social studies in the modern world, that needs only to be mentioned to be acknowledged. If anything, their importance will be even greater in the difficult years ahead, and especially for that half of the high school population that does not go on to college. Thus, the demands of modern life require an up-to-date version of the social studies curriculum.

> So do the demands of the underlying intellectual disciplines. The present curriculum has been resting largely on the same fields for half a century, despite the dramatic development over that period of a whole body of scholarly and scientific materials in the modern social and behavioral sciences. To a substantial extent, the social studies curriculum in the senior high school today is still based on the influential National Education Association report of 1916. Despite any number of local deviations, the general pattern includes civics or world geography in the ninth grade, world history in the tenth, United States history (usually by state law) in the eleventh, and an occasional Problems of Democracy in the twelfth. And despite several calls for reconsideration if not reform. . . there has not been a detailed national review of what the social studies curriculum ought to be. . . .
>
> In the past fifty years, the world has changed by a great order of magnitude. The major war in progress when the NEA report came out in 1916 now appears minor compared with the one we have had since, let alone the one we fear; the economic depression of the 1930's may be only a few pages of history to today's students but it was personally experienced by their teachers; developments in transportation and communication have pulled the world dramatically together while the national aspirations of newly emerging powers threaten in conflict to pull it apart. Certainly the least that can be said, by way of understatement, is that the high school student of today is going to be living in a far, far different world from that inhabited by the student of 1916.
>
> Nor is the change in the scholarly disciplines themselves much less dramatic, as measured by their own yardsticks. History and geography and political science were mainstays of the social studies then, and are now, though all of them have undergone important developments in coverage and method since that time. But economics and the so-called behavioral sciences (anthropology, psychology, sociology) have risen over the intervening years to the position of major clamants for attention in their own right. (Berelson 1962, pp. 3-5)

At the end of this work, Todd enumerated suggested actions to follow up the report:

> This brings us to the next steps the National Council for the Social Studies and the American Council of Learned Societies had in mind when they embarked on their joint venture. As Anderson indicated, "These steps follow logically." He then proceeded to summarize the proposals for moving into a comprehensive program of curriculum revision in the social studies.

> 1. Responsibility for the development of a curriculum must involve scholars representing the social sciences, persons concerned with curriculum and the psychology of learning, and classroom teachers at various grade levels. All of these persons need to be involved in the total task. This is not the kind of job that can be done by having each group do its part and then abdicate responsibility.
>
> 2. A university having a substantial program in teacher education and good working relationships with nearby school systems provides the ideal environment for the development of an experimental curriculum, try-outs, evaluation, and necessary revisions. The university and area school systems might underwrite some of the costs of this type of experimentation, but long-term outside support will be needed.
>
> 3. Ideally there should be several experimental centers, each free to use initiative but also fully informed of developments at other centers.
>
> 4. A committee, representing the National Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, should serve in a coordinating capacity, having responsibility for the preparation of publications reporting experimental programs, developing procedures leading to consensus regarding the curriculum, and working with state departments of education, publishers, and other interested parties to insure its implementation. (Todd 1962, pp. 33-301)

Of these four steps, the first three became reality, but the fourth, coordination, never occurred; in fact, such a consensus has never been achieved in the history of social studies education in the twentieth century.

Another 1962 volume which formed a part of the early history of the NSS movement and which, like the ACLS/NCSS work, dealt with the nature (or structure in some cases) of the social sciences and the state of the field in regional or area studies was *High School Social Studies Perspectives*, by Erling Hunt and others (Hunt et al. 1962).

Also in 1962, the California State Department of Education published a new social studies curriculum framework. Based on knowledge from eight social sciences, it took the form of valid generalizations which students should derive from their school social studies experiences. The eight social science disciplines were: 1) Geography (both physical and cultural),

2) History, 3) Political Science, 4) Economics, 5) Anthropology (both physical and cultural), 6) Psychology (including social psychology), 7) Sociology, and 8) Philosophy (State Curriculum Commission 1962).

The Stanford Conference. Two conferences held in 1963 contributed to the theoretical underpinnings of the NSS. The first of these conferences was the annual summer Cubberly Conference at Stanford University. The faculty of the Stanford School of Education had decided a year earlier that the 1963 conference should focus on the theme "The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future." Dean S. James Quillen, after alluding to newly announced funding of social studies curriculum projects by NSF's Course Content Improvement Section and USOE's Project Social Studies, observed that by July 1963 "there was unmistakable evidence of an emerging national concern for curriculum improvement in the social studies (Quillen 1963, p. 6.).

In his introduction to the collection of conference papers, G. Wesley Sowards noted that "it must be kept in mind as these papers are read that money and manpower have only recently been allocated to the social studies in a major way. . . and opportunity is at long last knocking at the door of the social scientist and the social studies educator (Sowards 1963 pp. 9-10). Sowards hoped that, as the door to social studies curriculum reform was opened, those entering would include school people, social science scholars, learning psychologists, and lay citizens, all blended in new work arrangements (Sowards 1963, pp. 14-15). Perhaps inadvertently he did not include educationists (that is, university-based social studies educators) on the new team.

Following Soward's introduction came the five major conference papers and an epilogue. The first paper, by Peter Odegard, charted the evolution of the social sciences in the twentieth century. Odegard staked out the boundaries of the social sciences somewhere between the physical/biological sciences and the humanities/arts, but with some overlap at each end of the continuum. For example, physical geography and physical anthropology overlap the physical sciences; while history, philosophy, and humanistic psychology flow into the arts and humanities. He next discussed the multiple methodologies used by practitioners in the social sciences, from syllogism to scientific method. He continued with the many perplexities

faced by social scientists, such as the fact/value issue and the observer/observed dilemma. Finally, Odegard confronted the moral problem inherent in the basic knowledge versus applied knowledge issue in social science. Here, he joined Robert Oppenheimer and other scientists, who recognize the moral imperative to consider the human consequences of scientific knowledge and attendant sociotechnological inventions. Odegard asserted that

> scientists are not immune from the responsibilities of other citizens. They need to be reminded that their attitudes of Olympian indifference and skepticism toward moral and ethical problems in a society that has all but canonized the scientist can issue in apathy and cynicism among others--attitudes dangerous alike to science and a good society (Odegard 1963, p. 40).

As American society has since learned, one ignores this injunction only at one's peril. It would also haunt many leaders of the NSS movement as they pursued their curriculum development labors amid the social upheavals of the sixties: a form of ultimate irony--the social scientist nearly overwhelmed by social reality.

A paper by Paul Hanna entitled "The Social Studies Program in the Elementary School in the Twentieth Century" followed the Odegard paper. After treating a number of issues dealing with sources and designs of the social studies curriculum, Hanna presented his own schema for a social studies program. The Hanna model, "The Expanding Community of Men," was based on two concepts: 1) the expanding social memberships of the human being from individual, to family, to school, to neighborhood, and so on through the world community, and 2) a set of nine basic human activities such as communicating and transporting. These two dimensions were woven into a composite, essentially a nine-by-eleven matrix. Since the Hanna model was focused primarily on human social membership groups and basic community functions, and only secondarily on the social science disciplines as sources of data, it had only limited appeal to NSS project directors (Hanna 1963, pp. 41-78).

As a final topic, Hanna suggested that the responsibility for designing new social studies programs should be shared by: 1) the learners, 2) the learners' teachers, 3) the teachers' organizations, 4) the academic scholars in history and the social sciences, 5) experts

in curriculum and instruction, and 6) lay citizens (Hanna 1963, pp. 76-78). Of these six groups, no evidence suggests that any NSS project ever had as staff members or advisory board members students or lay citizens. Furthermore, there was only limited participation by teachers' organizations and moderate involvement of experts in curriculum and instruction.

A companion piece to the Hanna paper was one by Quillen, entitled "The Social Studies in the Secondary School in the Twentieth Century." After a historical survey, the author presented "some conclusions concerning needs which grow out of this survey. . ." (Quillen 1963, p. 92). He listed eight needs:

1) elimination of excessive repetition;

2) greater emphasis on the social sciences (as separate and distinct from history) and on area studies of Asia, Africa, and Latin America;

3) planning a K-14 sequence with articulation from grade to grade, with attention to the logical structure of history and the social sciences and to contemporary social problems, and with attention to comprehensiveness and balance;

4) more "study in depth," or what Charles Keller calls historical "post-holing";

5) more accurate and up-to-date content;

6) wider range and variety of available curriculum materials coupled with more emphasis on individual study, small group discussion, inquiry, and reflective thinking;

7) new efforts to improve preservice and inservice teacher education and to improve the working conditions of social studies teachers; and

8) more extensive and adequately supported research and experimentation, as well as improved dissemination of information on promising developments (Quillen 1963, pp. 92-94).

These eight needs received differential treatment during the following decade in the NSS projects. The first efforts of NSS projects were on the second, fourth, fifth, and sixth needs, with a slighting of Latin America in the second need, and with only history-oriented projects dealing with the fourth need. The NSS projects did little with the first, third, and eighth needs, though dissemination and diffusion strategies became increasingly important as the projects neared completion. Late in the 1960s, most NSS projects began to address the seventh need.

The fourth conference paper was authored by Arno Bellack and focused on a central NSS conceptualization: "Structure in the Social Sciences and Implications for the Social Studies Program" (Bellack 1963, pp. 95-117). Drawing heavily on the work of Bruner (1962), Phenix (1956, pp. 137-143), and Schwab (1962, pp. 197-205), Bellack observed that the then current educational debate hinged on two old, familiar questions: "What is knowledge?" and "How should it be studied and taught?" (Bellack 1963, p. 96). He then asserted that "a widely held contemporary approach to curriculum-building places emphasis on the *logical* order inherent in knowledge itself, on the structures of concepts and principles that characterize the various disciplines" (Bellack 1963, p. 96). Bellack devoted most of the remainder of his paper to an explanation of the nature of the structure(s) of an academic discipline.

The following description, which may over-simplify this rather sophisticated epistemological idea is presumably what NSS theoreticians had in mind when they referred to the "concept of the structure(s) of a discipline of knowledge" as a basis for deriving a social studies curriculum.

By structure is usually meant the theories, concepts, generalizations, and modes of inquiry used by the practitioners in a particular discipline. A structure is like a special set of glasses an anthropologist (or economist, or political scientist, or geographer, etc.) wears to guide the gathering, analyzing, and interpreting of data. Anthropologists know the accumulated knowledge of their discipline; that is, they know the facts which form the root, descriptive knowledge of the particular discipline. They also know the principles, generalizations, and laws which, by consensus, have been accepted as true in the discipline. In addition, anthropologists know those models, theories, and concepts which direct and focus on-going inquiry in the discipline. Each theory is considered a tentative model of truth and serves as the basis for framing hypotheses to guide the collection of data and experimentation. Finally, anthropologists know the tools and modes of inquiry appropriate to investigation and knowledge production in the discipline. A mode of inquiry is a methodology or "technology" used to guide discovery and proof, a set of procedures used for measuring the quality and quantity of

data and guiding how one should apply the cannons of evidence. Thus, within anthropology (or any discipline) one finds three basic structures: (1) facts or descriptive knowledge; (2) sets of models, theories, concepts, generalizations, principles, and laws; and (3) a mode (or modes) of inquiry.

The social studies educator who organizes a course by *eras* is applying one of the structures of history to the organization of the course. In the hope that students will learn the defining characteristics of an era, the teacher is teaching a basic concept of history--classifying a sequence of events into a characterization of an *era*. Of course, this teacher is also teaching another structure of history--those records and interpretations of events selected to typify the era under study. Obviously, the use of eras in history provides the teacher with a needed economy. By teaching for understanding of the defining characteristics of an era, the teacher is freed from using *all* of the facts that may be related to any era. The teacher need only select examples sufficient to the task of describing and defining an era.

Teaching concepts is also less bulky than teaching collections of facts and data. However, it is more complex. It isn't difficult to discuss the lives of Petrarch or Michaelangelo, but it takes more insight and understanding to discuss these men as typifying certain characteristics of the Italian Renaissance. It's easy to interest students in the novelties of Indian marriages and families, but to fit these tidbits into the concepts of matrilineal and patrilineal family organizations is at a higher level of conceptual understanding and requires a more thorough knowledge of the structures of anthropology.

The variety of processes or modes of inquiry used to expand the storehouse of knowledge in a discipline can also be taught in lieu of collections of facts and data. In fact, this methodological structure may be of more use to the student from the point of view of transfer of learning and of learning to learn than other structures.

There is a variety of tools and methodologies used by social scientists. The anthropologist uses participant observation; the economist uses econometrics; the historian employs historical method; the sociologist may rely on the case study method or on sociometrics; the political scientist

may use survey research; the social psychologist may employ the experimental or laboratory method; and the geographer may use cartography. Some methodologies are more prevalent than others, and some are used by more than one discipline.

The specific methodologies used by social scientists do not separately or collectively constitute a mode of inquiry. A mode of inquiry is a more pervasive scheme for testing hypotheses, solving problems, or answering questions. For example, Fenton proposes the following set of steps as a basic mode of inquiry:

1. Recognizing a problem from data

2. Formulating hypotheses
   a. Asking analytical questions
   b. Stating hypotheses
   c. Remaining aware of the tentative nature of hypotheses

3. Recognizing the logical implications of hypotheses

4. Gathering data
   a. Deciding what data will be needed
   b. Selecting or rejecting sources

5. Analyzing, evaluating, and interpreting data
   a. Selecting relevant data from sources
   b. Evaluating sources
      Determining the frame of reference of an author
      Determining the accuracy of statements of fact
   c. Interpreting the data

6. Evaluating the hypotheses in light of the data
   a. Modifying the hypotheses, if necessary
      Rejecting the logical implications unsupported by data
      Restating the hypotheses
   b. Stating a generalization (Fenton 1967, pp. 16-17).

Within such a mode of inquiry, many distinct tools may be employed. For example, in "gathering data" the survey technique may be used. Statistics is a tool for manipulating data so that they can be more easily interpreted.

A mode of inquiry, then, is a scheme for attacking a problem. As a process, a mode of inquiry

> refers to all the random, or ordered, operations which can be associated with knowledge and with human activities. There are a variety of processes through which knowledge is created. . . . It at once becomes clear that the nature of process, as we conceive of it, is more than an intellectual

> amalgam. It exists in an infinite variety of shapes and forms; indeed, processes must exist which cannot readily be identified, much less described. Nevertheless, every process, whatever its character, necessarily must have a construct, an underlying scheme which provides order, and direction (Parker and Rubin 1966, p. 2).

A social science discipline, then, has a structure within which exist at least three components or sub-structures. These sub-structures can in turn be adapted to a social studies curriculum by focusing on the economy of learning concepts and generalizations rather than solely on a collection of data, and by emphasizing the learning of tools and modes of inquiry, again rather than on collections of data. In these emphases, data are necessary but not sufficient; that is, one *uses* data to learn concepts and generalizations, and to practice and learn modes of inquiry. In these settings the data are of secondary importance, however, to concepts, generalizations, and modes of inquiry.

After his discussion of structures, Bellack cited several examples of the application of the idea of structure to social studies education, and then concluded the paper by raising a number of crucial questions with respect to the structures approach. First, he raised the question of "how to match the intellectual level of students with growing complexity of ideas. . ." (Bellack 1963, p. 111). Second, he posed the question of balance among the social sciences: "Man's social life is always more complex than the limited model of it reflected in the findings of any one of the social sciences" (Bellack 1963, p. 111). Third, Bellack asked a set of questions dealing with how to apply the social sciences to social problems and policy issues. His fourth and final question was one of values: how to distinguish "between social analysis and valuing" in the development of a social studies curriculum (Bellack 1963, p. 111).

If the structures of knowledge approach was the heart of the NSS movement, especially from 1963 to 1968, the problems implied by this approach, and alluded to early on by Bellack, would constantly plague the developers. In some cases, the problems of scope and sequence, of levels of cognitive development, and of fact and value were abjured or ignored. The problems of how to handle social issues and how to decide on policy alternatives were addressed by very few projects, and these problems became nightmares for project leaders and staffs as civil rights, student activism,

and Vietnam exploded across the nation in the late sixties.

The fifth and final paper of the conference was given by Ralph Tyler, who summarized the previous four papers and then presented his own views. Tyler enumerated "several reasons for the current inadequacy of the social studies." First, according to Tyler, everyone was confused about the educational goals and objectives of this amorphous broad field in the curriculum. Second, "the schools have had inadequate intellectual resources upon which to draw in developing the educational program in this field." A third reason was that "the social studies curricula have been poorly planned." Finally, "the social studies are very frequently assigned to teachers whose major field of interest lies elsewhere" (Tyler 1963, p. 119-32).

In the remainder of his paper, Tyler offered suggestions for the mobilization of money and talent to deal with these four inadequacies. Here he relied heavily on a 1959 "Conference on Policies and Strategy for Strengthening the Curriculum of the American Public Schools." Out of this conference came two recommendations: one to establish study groups which were to redefine objectives, content, and organization of the curriculum, and to develop and experiment with new instructional materials (with at least *two* study groups for each separate subject), and a second recommendation to form one or more study groups to deal with problems of organizing the school curriculum *as a whole*, problems of scope and sequence both within and between subjects. These two recommendations were to be realized by 1) bringing together scholars and school personnel to plan and create new curricula; 2) establishing strategies for development and evaluation of curriculum ideas, materials, and practices, including field trials in the schools and revision on the basis of feedback from the trials; and 3) creating multiple centers to encourage divergent approaches toward curriculum revision (Tyler 1963, pp. 129-31).

Of these two recommendations and three implementation strategies, the leaders of the NSS, for the most part, never adequately dealt with the social studies curriculum *as a whole*, and were totally oblivious to the problems of articulation between and among broad subject fields in the school curriculum *as a whole*. If it can be considered a strength, the NSS project directors *did* promote variety and diversity in approaches to

particular courses, in particular course sequences (such as, K-6, 7-9, 7-12, 9-12, or 10-12), in types of materials, media, and packaging, and in teaching styles and strategies (even though inquiry learning and teaching was a motto).

The Syracuse Conference. The other 1963 conference which spearheaded the NSS was held at Syracuse University under the directorship of Roy Price and with financial support from USOE. The conference report, *Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies*, contained an overview by Price, followed by six proceedings papers, and concluding with three summaries of discussion groups. Of the 38 listed participants, three were NSS project directors, five were consultants to NSS projects, three were from USOE (which launched and funded Project Social Studies), ten were scholars from the social sciences, and three were high school social studies teachers (Price 1964).

Although the presenters and participants often became preoccupied with the academic exercise of defining the nature of "research," the broad themes which would dominate the NSS were clearly visible in most of the papers and discussion summaries. Also present were the bothersome dilemmas which of necessity inhere in social studies education, like the fact/value issue, the objectivity/indoctrination problem, and the verbalization/social action continuum.

The major NSS themes developed by conferees were: 1) teaching the methodologies (that is, modes of inquiry) of the social sciences; 2) teaching the attitudes or mind-set of the scientist and of scientific investigation (for example, probability and tentativity of truth); 3) teaching the applications of scientific methods to policy problems; 4) the contemporary requisites for being or becoming an effective social studies teacher, especially knowledge in the broad spectrum of social science disciplines; 5) the application of learning theory to curriculum and instruction, especially cognition theories (for example, conceptual learning); 6) the focus on intellectual goals and objectives for the social studies curriculum; and 7) the reorientation of educational research toward *curriculum* evaluation (Price 1964).

Impending Reform

There were no clear indications in *Social Education*, the Official Journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, that a curriculum reform effort in social studies education was under way until the April 1963 issue. Yet, prior to this, articles had appeared which dealt with separate facets of the NSS. For example, although the study of primary source historical documents and historical method had been advocated for social studies courses now and then since the nineteenth century, in the May 1961 *Social Education* McAulay advocated "using the historical method in the elementary school" (McAulay 1961, pp. 247-249). In October 1962 Moulton suggested the use in the junior high school of primary source documents as means for solving particular historical problems (Moulton 1962, pp. 310-312).

There were other hints of the nature of the impending reform movement. Taking his clues from Bruner (*The Process of Education*), Sutherland searched for a structure of history (Sutherland 1962, pp. 133-136, 140). Stavrianos argued for the proposition that "social studies are now of greater significance than the physical sciences so far as our national survival is concerned." He continued by lamenting "the lack of communication between college and high school teachers" by arguing for cooperation between scholars and school teachers in the revision of courses and textbooks, and by citing "examples of the ferment that is now making itself felt from one end of the country to the other" (Stavrianos 1962, pp. 129-132). Jarolimek explored the possible curriculum applications of the taxonomy of objectives for the cognitive domain which Bloom and others had developed six years earlier (Jarolimek 1962, pp. 445-447).* Platt advocated the use of concepts as curriculum organizers which can "give the learner, at the earliest level, perhaps even in kindergarten, a frame of reference for thinking in positive terms. . . . The concept approach can provide an incentive to seek new knowledge as an adventure, challenging and rewarding in itself. . . . Perhaps, too, the concept approach will put the social studies on a firm structural foundation so that they can readily

*The taxonomy referred to is: Bloom, Benjamin S. et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*, New York, NY: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956.

incorporate the new knowledge being discovered daily" (Platt 1963, pp. 21-22, 41).

The theme of the April 1963 issue of *Social Education* was "Revising the Social Studies." There were few references, however, to any of the national social studies projects already in existence. Instead the authors in this issue dwelled on their own conceptualizations, concerns, and cautions with respect to anticipated social studies reform efforts. For example, in the lead editorial Todd warned against "the danger of limited vision and intellectual arrogance." He exhorted the profession to avoid the fragmentation implicit in the structure of a discipline approach. What was needed, Lewis Paul Todd asserted, was "for specialists from every field to join in a dedicated effort to build a social studies program that will plunge the student into the whole of life" (Todd 1963, pp. 181,204).

In the same issue, Shirley Engle presented his "thoughts in regard to revision." He felt that what was needed was "attention to the structure of the social studies along the lines which are being so successfully used to improve instruction in the sciences and mathematics." Engle suggested two sets of curriculum organizers:

> first, that every human society. . . possesses certain basic characteristics in common with other societies; and second, that the social problems to which serious and responsible social scientists, philosophers, politicians, and citizens devote attention are merely variations of basic social problems which persist from time to time and society to society. (Engle 1963, pp. 182-84, 196)

Thus, for Engle, those who attempt to revise the social studies curriculum should begin with a list of "basic ideas or concepts" which explain human social experience and a second list of the "persistent social problems of the society." (Engle 1963, p. 196)

Engle provided a list of nine basic concepts (for example, social group, economic organization, and freedom) which students should be exposed to with "regularly recurring emphasis," and also a set of eight persistent social problems (for example, How do we reconcile individual freedom with social control, especially in a period of growing interdependence?) which should "receive continuous attention." The concepts

and problems would be linked in a variation of a double helix, and would spiral upward from one grade level to the next.

The Engle article was complemented by a paper on "an inquiry-centered approach" written by one of Engle's protégés, Byron Massialas. Massialas argued "that a generalization. . . which purports to explain complicated behavioral and societal phenomena, unless conjoined with a scheme of investigation, does not automatically ensure understanding and does not, in itself, offer a dependable tool for predictability of the future." What Massialas would add to Engle's concepts and problems were "models of search, verifiability, and invention which the learner employs in his quest to find dependable knowledge," and also "the study of value conflicts in our society and alternative approaches to understanding or resolving them" (Massialas 1963, pp. 185-89).

Next, Paul Hanna pointed to what he considered some of the more promising current efforts. These were: 1) USOE's *Project Social Studies*, 2) NSF's Course Content Improvement Program in the social sciences, 3) the ACLS/NCSS volume, *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, and 4) the separate task forces in professional associations: American Economic Association, American Association of Geographers and National Council on Geographic Education, American Anthropological Association, and American Sociological Association (Hanna, April 1963, pp. 190-96).

In his appraisal of efforts to date, Hanna observed that "very few current projects begin with an overall design. A few even reject any coordinated approach. One looks in vain for proposals on scope and sequence that have institutional or organizational support"(Hanna, April 1963, p. 191).

The remainder of the Hanna article dealt with his scheme of expanding human environments overlaid by basic human activities, each environment having time (history) and space (geography) dimensions, each human activity drawing content from one or more social sciences, and each community, from family to world, studied in sequence from kindergarten to twelfth grade (Hanna, April 1963, pp. 191-96).

Lawrence Metcalf offered a contrasting rationale to those of the other authors (Metcalf 1963, pp. 197-201). Drawing on his collaborative work in 1955 with Maurice Hunt (Hunt and Metcalf 1955), he described the

"reflective thinking in the closed areas" approach to secondary school social studies curriculum. "Closed areas were defined as areas of belief and thought which are largely closed to rational thought." Metcalf argued that students should be taught to think reflectively about the perplexities involved in such problems/topics "as sex, economics, religion, race, and social class . . ." (Metcalf 1963, p. 198).

The final article in this series was by a historian, Thomas Mendenhall, who agreed "that other approaches besides the historical to the study of human society might be useful, proper, and necessary at the secondary school level." He encouraged the use of perspectives from the social sciences to illuminate historical topics and eras. He warned, however, that "there are all too few history teachers in school or college with sufficient training in social science to make the transition themselves." Thus, he advocated "an extensive program of summer institutes . . . , the preparation of textbooks and other teaching material, radical changes in teacher-training programs, and scholarly attention to syllabi for possible courses in the true spirit of the 'new' history . . ." (Mendenhall 1963, pp. 202-4).

The Heart of the Movement: Curriculum Materials Projects

Launching the New Social Studies Projects

One way of charting the momentum in the NSS movement is to record the proliferation of national projects over time. If Senesh and Fenton were the forerunners and exemplars of the incipient NSS in the fifties, by the end of 1963 they had been joined by a number of other reformers--individual theoreticians as well as project directors and their staffs.

The Amherst history project had its beginnings during the 1959-60 academic year. Van Halsey had initiated a series of meetings that year with historians from Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts, and with teachers from five nearby high schools. By 1963 the Halsey group had developed ten two-week units, with several dozen more planned, from which teachers could design their own United States history courses as alternatives to the traditional textbooks then in use. Each unit dealt with a separate important historical

topic (for example, The Negro and American Life Since the Civil War), and included a teacher's guide and a selection of student readings, primarily original source documents. The teacher's guide contained suggested lesson plans, lead questions for initiating discussions, oral and written assignments, and information on the unit topics. Five of the first ten units were scheduled for publication by D.C. Heath in the fall of 1963 (Halsey 1963, pp. 249-252).

In 1961, three NSS projects were launched, all emanating from professional associations and all, sooner or later, funded by the National Science Foundation. The High School Geography Project of the Association of American Geographers, in cooperation with the National Council on Geographic Education, was begun under the directorship of Nicholas Helburn at Montana State University in Bozeman. At Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, the Sociological Resources for the Secondary School (later "for the Social Studies") project of the American Sociological Association opened its offices with Robert Feldmesser as director. Under the directorship of Malcolm Collier, the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project of the American Anthropological Association was begun at the University of Chicago.

USOE announced initiation of Project Social Studies in the November 1962 *Social Education*. In less than a full page, experts in education and in the academic disciplines of history and the social sciences were invited to submit proposals for funds "to discuss ways of improving research, instruction, teacher education, and dissemination of information in this field." Under Public Law 83-531, which created and funded the Cooperative Research Program, funds were allocated to Project Social Studies for fiscal year 1963 to support three types of field activities: 1) basic and applied research projects; 2) curriculum study centers; and 3) research development activities ("More About Project...," p. 411).

A year later, Gerald R. Smith of USOE reported on the status of Project Social Studies. During the interim, seven curriculum centers, 11 research projects, and two developmental activities had been approved for funding (Smith 1963, pp. 357-59, 409).

The seven curriculum study centers were charged with fulfilling one or more of five purposes:

> 1) to redefine the aims of social studies curriculums at one or more grade levels; 2) to develop sequences of presenting subject matter that are based on what is known about human development and the teaching-learning processes; 3) to work out methods and prepare materials to meet specific needs; 4) to try out new methods and materials and evaluate them; and 5) to disseminate information about the most promising methods and materials. (Smith 1963, pp. 357).

The seven centers (institution, director, contract period, and mission) were:

1) Carnegie Institute of Technology (now Carnegie-Mellon University), Edwin Fenton, April 1963 to April 1967, "to prepare materials and make suggestions on reading materials for able students of history and social sciences in grades 9-12.

2) University of Minnesota, Edith West, April 1963 to June 1967, "to identify the structure of each of the social science disciplines . . . [and] prepare and evaluate guides and materials to be used from kindergarten through grade 14."

3) Harvard University, Donald W. Oliver, July 1963 to June 1968, to "plan a social science curriculum based on an analysis of public issues . . . including approximately 30 teaching units organized around 5 persistent social problems, [and to] select, develop, and evaluate instructional materials and teaching procedures for grades 8, 9, and 10."

4) Syracuse University, Roy A. Price, May 1963 to June 1968, to "identify the basic concepts which should be communicated to students in the social studies program and prepare illustrative materials for three grade levels."

5) Ohio State University, Edward J. Furst (later James P. Shaver, followed by Meno Lovenstein), October 1963 to September 1966, to "analyze the structure of economics as a discipline, prepare materials [for a ninth-grade economics course], and disseminate information . . ."

6) Northwestern University, Jonathon McLendon, September 1963 to June 1968, to improve "instruction about U.S. society in grades 5, 8, and 11, . . . to eliminate the unnecessary duplication that occurs . . . at these grades and . . . develop and evaluate instructional materials to replace those that are eliminated."

7) University of Illinois, Ella C. Leppert, August 1963 to December 1968, to develop "three sequential courses for a social studies program for the secondary school, [as part] of a 5-year sequence designed to help students understand the basic structure of the social order, the dynamic nature of societies, and the effects of social change." (Smith 1963, pp. 357-8)

Of the eleven approved research projects, only seven were contracted and funded at the time Smith was writing his report. Of these seven, only two appear to be related even peripherally to the general scope of the NSS movement. The two funded developmental activities were the Stanford and Syracuse conferences which were discussed earlier in this paper.

Concerns, Cautions, and Forebodings

In the same issue of *Social Education* that contained the Smith report appeared an article on "Ferment in the Social Studies" by Donald Robinson. This perceptive commentator offered not only a recapitulation of the needs for reform and a descriptive account of current revision activities, but also a series of insightful speculations on the probable successes and failures of the NSS movement (Robinson 1963, pp. 360-4, 410).

Robinson observed that "everyone has a different notion of what the social studies should attempt," though some insist there should be "a uniform curriculum" Still, "no evidence has yet been produced--historical, philosophical, statistical, or experimental--to demonstrate the superiority of any pattern of social studies disciplines over other patterns for instructional purposes." He, therefore, forecasted that "curriculum reform will continue to result from diverse, and often contradictory trends, which eventually produce recognizable patterns, if not uniformity" (Robinson 1963, pp. 360-1). No generalization with respect to the era of the "new social studies" seems more warrented than this 1963 assertion by Robinson.

Commenting on the social studies scene in 1963, as well as prophesying rather accurately the succeeding decade, Robinson made the claim that "what does not exist, and will never exist again, is stereotyped uniformity of curriculum or of method"; that "the diversity and the ferment will continue, and from time to time new dominant patterns will emerge." But

he lamented the constant appeals to "urgency, urgency," and suggested that "one of the needs of the social studies is to be somewhat insulated, not from the crucial problems, but from the neurotic sense of urgency" (Robinson 1963, p. 361).

Anticipating the pressures of the late 1960s. Robinson suggested that some teachers and students "need to be made alive to crucial issues of our times," that some teachers "need to learn to treat their students with the dignity appropriate to the role of a thinking individual," that "students need not be made to think alike . . . [or] even interpret alike the criteria for thoughtful citizenship," that "historical scholarship is one of a number of specialized goals needed by some students, but not by all," and finally, and perhaps most significantly, that "acceptance of diversity and pluralism is a must if we are to live successfully with emerging peoples within our country and without" (Robinson 1963, p. 361).

Also in the Robinson article were brief allusions to two organizations destined to emerge as important contributors to the NSS movement. Educational Services Incorporated (later Education Development Center) was a curriculum materials development center which was founded by such luminaries as Jerome Bruner and Elting Morrison and which produced several NSS courses, among which were: *From Subject to Citizen* and *Man: A Course of Study*. The Social Science Education Consortium was organized at Purdue University to promote cooperation and sharing among social science curriculum development projects in the midwest region, especially projects located at "Big Ten" universities (Robinson 1963, p. 361).

As NSS projects multiplied from 1964 onward, a few leaders in social studies education began to worry about the lack of dialogue concerning the broad questions of rationale and the seeming abandonment of interest in issues of scope and sequence. One such commentator was James Becker, who in January 1965 observed that there was near consensus on the needs for revision, reform and revolution in the social studies, but that, ironically, "never before in our history has there been less general agreement about precisely what needs changing and how the changes should be made" (Becker 1965, p. 20). He added that what existed was "nearly total confusion concerning ways of defining and meeting the agreed upon needs" (Becker 1965, p. 20).

The reasons for the confusion and lack of agreement, Becker said, are "that the social sciences *per se* are too young and too yeasty a field to be able to provide us in the schools with a neatly packaged set of goals and objectives," and that "the social sciences, unlike the physical and natural sciences, deal directly with the stuff of human society," an arena in which "controversy is most likely to occur and emotions become involved" (Becker 1965, p. 21).

Nor was Becker sanguine about the prospects for any kind of radical change--in education or in the social studies. "Widely dispersed power, lack of strong central authority, [and] responsiveness to variations in ideological, social, and political outlook" blunt and diffuse specific reforms, especially those which are drastic departures from the status quo. Also, "precisely because the society itself is diffuse and decentralized, and the schools are too, this struggle [for reform] usually lacks decisive battles and clear-cut issues."(Becker 1965, p. 22)

Becker acknowledged "that educational change does take place, but that it seldom moves far ahead of public attitudes and that teacher competence and availability of materials are futher inhibiting factors" (Becker 1965, p. 22). He undoubtedly would have agreed, however, with Robinson's conclusion that "social studies goals and curricula will continue to be fashioned of a combination of national tradition, suggestive state programs, locally prescribed curricula, the considerable influence of textbooks, universities, and professional organizations, and the final distillation of these and other influences by the classroom teacher" (Robinson 1963, p. 362).

The NSS movement had become reality by November 1963, with over a dozen projects well under way, supported by funds from NSF and USOE. Another chain of events in American society, however, was altering the national ambience from one of optimism and confidence, of faith in progress and education--a mood which had led to the launching of the NSS--to one of vulnerability, disenchantment, brooding anomie, and loss of purpose and direction. This new climate would not pervade the national landscape until later in the decade, but an ominous symbol of the coming storm occurred in the same November that saw such high hopes for a revolution in social studies education. Less than a week before the forty-third annual conference,

of NCSS in Los Angeles, the pride of "the best and brightest," John F. Kennedy, was assassinated on November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Texas. A shocked nation and world wondered at the meaning of this event, while some 17,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam also wondered what the event might mean for them. For the editor of *Social Education*, the assassination and the murder of the assassin had "stripped the veil from the face of violence and reminded all of us that in our time law and order contend the world over with the jungle rule of claw and fang" (Todd 1964, p. 63). For the leaders of the NSS, the event was but one of many to follow which would confront them with the perennial dilemma of Western civilization--analysis and objectivity versus personal/social action and value commitment. Or put another way, they would be faced with the necessity of choosing between curricular approaches which include or ignore, encourage or avoid, commitments to particular sets of values and to involvements in personal and sociopolitical causes, that is, to acting on beliefs.

Early Efforts in Teacher Education

While funded NSS projects were engaged in the time-consuming tasks of preparing new curriculum materials, and while other individuals and groups were preparing proposals for funding of new curriculum projects, a separate yet related NSS activity was gaining increased recognition. Prior to 1965, most of the inservice education of social studies teachers was conducted on meagre finances by school districts, with some assistance from college and university professors of history and the social sciences and education, who taught both on-campus and off-campus courses for teachers. Though a relatively small influence in terms of numbers of teachers served, the John Hay Fellows Program in the humanities provided superior summer and academic year experiences for a small, select group of secondary school social studies teachers.

The summer institutes program of NSF began preparing school science and mathematics teachers for the curricula of the new mathematics and new science movements in the mid-fifties. In the early sixties several of these institutes were funded for high school teachers of economics. Later in the decade, NSF summer and academic year institutes were available to social studies teachers in general social science, anthropology, economics, geography, political science, and sociology, though not in history.

Lobbying efforts by NCSS and other professional organizations resulted in amendments to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), such that the institutes program under the Act was expanded to include history, geography, and civics. Other legislation of the mid-60's made it possible for social studies teachers to attend nine-month and twelve-month Experienced Teacher Fellowship programs--well-financed training experiences which began in 1966 and were terminated in 1971.

In the early years, NSF and NDEA teacher inservice programs, primarily summer sessions of two to eight weeks, concentrated instruction on new ways of structuring knowledge in history and the social sciences, with perhaps one-tenth to one-fourth of the total time of an institute devoted to pedagogical matters, including teaching methods and curriculum materials. Later, as new curriculum materials became available--at first only in experimental, field-test form--and as participants and staffs began to recognize the need for more than mere subject matter background, the institute programs began to incorporate the analysis of the new materials "packages" and the methods, chiefly inquiry, required for their use with students.

A side benefit of the use of new curriculum "packages" in NSF, NDEA, and EPDA inservice programs was the exposure provided to the curriculum materials prior to or shortly after their commercial publication. This enhanced visibility, combined with project decisions to pilot materials in a number of geographically dispersed field-test schools, aided the process of dissemination of the new units, courses, and curricula.

In the March 1975 *Social Education*, NCSS alerted teachers to the new "Opportunities for Teachers" of history and geography made available by the extension and expansion of NDEA legislation ("Opportunities..." 1965, p. 179). The next decade would witness thousands of social studies teachers, mainly junior and senior high school teachers, being paid by NSF and USOE to attend humdreds of summer and academic year programs. To the chagrin of federal officials and institute directors, many of these "institute goers" never returned to public school teaching but instead earned advanced degrees and moved to administrative and curriculum specialist positions in school districts or to professorial positions in higher education.

Informing the Profession

To keep the profession informed of progress being made by the NSS projects, journals such as *Social Education, The Social Studies, Educational Leadership* (journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), and the *Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary School Principals periodically published individual articles written by staff members of a project or devoted an entire issue to status reports from the projects. For example, in the April 1964 issue of *Social Education,* Shaver and Oliver presented "a brief summary of the major facets" of the Harvard Social Studies Project (Shaver and Oliver 1964, pp. 191-4, 248).

Virtually the entire issue of the April 1965 *Social Education* was devoted to a "Report on Project Social Studies." An overview article by Edwin Fenton and John Good was followed by reports from eight centers (Minnesota, Georgia, Illinois, Ohio State, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Syracuse, Harvard, and Northwestern), a report on the newer centers established in 1964, and finally an article by John Michaelis on "Social Studies Project Reports and Other Publications"(Michaelis 1965, pp. 206-27).

The Fenton-Good article opened with the assertion that "the curriculum revolution which began in mathematics, the natural sciences, and modern foreign languages about a decade ago has at last reached the social studies." The authors stated that there existed then "more than 40 curriculum development projects of national significance" in the area of social studies. Of these 40, 12 were funded under USOE's Project Social Studies.

> Each of the 12 Centers is located in a university and headed by a university professor; in one instance a high school teacher is a co-director. Most of the 12 projects include four groups of people on their staffs: scholars from subject departments; experts in learning theory, sometimes drawn from Departments of Education; practicing high school teachers, many of whom try out material in the classroom; and psychometricians responsible for assessing the effectiveness of the project. (Fenton and Good 1965, p. 206)

Although the Fenton-Good article occupied a scant three pages, at least one new term and a number of their generalizations deserve mention. It was in this article that the national curriculum materials development

projects were first collectively referred to as "the new social studies" (Fenton and Good 1965, p. 207). The broad characteristics of the NSS movement also were described:

> 1. With the single exception of Donald Oliver's project at Harvard, each of the HEW [USOE] curriculum projects in the social studies seeks to identify the structure of social science disciplines or to build a curriculum around social science concepts . . . . Thus far, however, no consensus about structure has emerged.
>
> 2. [In lieu of the traditional method of exposition, the NSS advocates] a set of teaching strategies diversely called the discovery method, hypothetical (from hypothesis) teaching, or an inductive approach.
>
> 3. With the exception of Harvard, all of the projects intend to teach generalizations and concepts drawn from the disciplines of history and the social sciences.
>
> 4. In the courses which are being designed, students will organize knowledge as historians, geographers, political scientists, economists, anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists organize it.
>
> 5. [Most projects] intend to integrate materials and techniques from various disciplines within each course they write . . . . Moreover, the new history courses are incorporating much more material from social science than traditional courses have done in the past.
>
> 6. [Some projects emphasize] the mode of inquiry of history and the social sciences, [by which is meant] the manner in which practicing social scientists develop and validate hypotheses, [a shift] away from the accumulation of facts for their own sake to learning facts as part of the thinking process of scholars.
>
> 7. [The projects are attempting to pay] attention to sequential and cumulative learning experiences . . . , to build each course securely upon what students already know . . . , to develop a hierarchy of learning to be taught in sequence beginning with the simple and moving toward the more sophisticated.
>
> 8. Several directors are also concentrating their attention on devices to eliminate unnecessary repition which has sometimes crept into cyclical curricula.
>
> 9. Project directors have taken seriously [Bruner's] contention that any idea can be taught to a child at any age in some form.

10. The project staffs are writing a host of new materials of a bewildering variety . . . . They consist of readings, games, films, tapes, transparencies for the overhead projector, slide tapes, and other audio-visual aids . . . . All of these materials imply new teaching strategies.

11. In the past, history, geography, and civics have formed the heart of the social studies curriculum. Now anthropology, sociology, economics, political science, and other disciplines clamor for a place.

12. [Involving teachers in the projects, as field-test teachers and in some cases as writers of materials or of teacher's guides and lesson plans, helps] to reveal the problems for teachers which the curriculum projects will bring . . . . The implications for pre-service and in-service training are plain.

13. Most groups try out their material on experimental classes and test their results against control groups in the same schools. At several centers, testers are developing new evaluating instruments designed to assess the ability to reach objectives not covered by traditional examinations.

14. No arrangements have been made for publication, nor has a policy been established by the government. Several committees have wrestled with the publication problem for three years, and innumerable meetings devoted to weighing the interests of the four major groups involved--the public, the universities, the authors, and the publishers--have taken place.

15. [In regard to the future], we will face several fresh problems: [how to] choose intelligently among the flood of new approaches . . . , [how to] incorporate the work of the best of the projects into an integrated and sequential curriculum when the directors of these projects may have begun from quite different premises . . . , [how to] re-educate our present generation of teachers to handle new materials in new ways. . . , [and, finally, how to] change pre-service education to prepare the next generation of teachers for the challenges of the new social studies?" (Fentor and Good 1965, pp. 207-8)

These 15 points probably represent the most succinct description of the NSS movement that exists. Curiously, nowhere in this issue of *Social Education* are NSF-funded projects (the most generously funded of all the NSS projects) described. These projects were the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project (ACSP), the High School Geography Project (HSGP), ESI/EDC's

Man: A Course of Study (MACOS), and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (SRSS). Also omitted was the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC).

Following progress reports from the eight original Project Social Studies centers came brief abstracts describing four new projects begun in 1964. These projects were: (1) San Jose State College; Co-directors John G. Sperling and Suzanne E. Wiggins; to develop a twelfth-grade, one-semester course in economics; (2) Amherst College; Director Van R. Halsey; to develop source material units for use in U.S. history courses in junior and senior high schools; (3) Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Director Daniel Lerner; to develop a two-semester course on social phenomena and the social environment for students whose careers will be in natural science and engineering; and (4) University of California at Berkeley; Director John U. Michaelis; to develop guides and materials for teaching about Asian nations and cultures in elementary and secondary schools ("Center Established..." 1965, pp. 224-5).

If the Fenton-Good article and the 15 generalizations excerpted from it represent the essence of the NSS reform movement, the 12 USOE-funded Project Social Studies projects, the NSF-funded ACSP, HSGP, MACOS, and SRSS projects, the Senesh "Our Working World" project, a few other national projects, and the clearinghouse activities of SSEC represent the core activities of the NSS. Clearly, this nucleus of some two dozen projects already manifested considerable diversity within the general theme of the structures approach, but after 1965 the next wave of projects at national, state, and local levels, all claiming some loyalty to the NSS, moved off in all imaginable directions. This proliferation of NSS curriculum projects is evidenced in a 1969 Pennsylvania Department of Education publication, *Directory of Social Studies Curriculum Projects*, which listed abstracts of 70 projects classified under ten headings: Anthropology, Civics-Government, Comprehensive, Conservation, Economics, Geography, Sociology, U.S. Culture (History), World Affairs, and World Cultures (*Directory of Social Studies*... 1969). Further evidence of the wide-ranging nature of the NSS is provided in a concluding chapter, "A Review of New Curriculum Developments and Projects," in a 1965 book edited by John Michaelis and Montgomery Johnston. In the main body of

the chapter, Michaelis referred to over 100 separate citations, and at the end of the chapter, in a "Directory of Social Studies Projects," he listed 33 projects and 12 "Related Studies" (Michaelis 1965, pp. 275-305).

Early Critiques of the NSS Projects

In the April 1965 issue of *Social Education*, a major portion of which was devoted to reports from the NSS projects, the editor indicated that in a later issue of the journal, space would be made available for the publication of letters expressing reactions to the NSS reports. In the October 1965 issue, nine letters appeared, most of which contained cautions and critiques of the NSS movement ("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, pp. 356-60). The writer of the first letter worried that the projects "are moving in such a variety of directions that there is a real danger that national confusion may result." He suggested the need for "*coordination* of projects" and for "research into the *common* vital issues facing man today"("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, p. 356). One writer cautioned that the

> fashionable emphasis on 'inductive thinking' or 'discovery method' may lead students either to think they have discovered a structure by 'creativity or intellectual autonomy' when in actuality they had been seduced by the curriculum developer and the teacher to re-discover the structure or to really invent or create their own structures which are different and remote from those of social scientists. ("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, p. 356).

One of the letter writers offered a list of strengths and weaknesses. Three strengths were "the introduction of the social sciences into the curriculum," "the emphasis on methods of inquiry," and "the effort to incorporate non-Western cultures." The weaknesses pointed to were the emphasis "on the empirical and cognitive dimensions of learning" to the neglect of "the normative and affective components of the curriculum," the placing of "a disproportionate emphasis on the 'structure of the disciplines'" to the neglect "of other sources of curriculum development--the individual and the society," and finally, too "little genuine concern . . . with instructional strategies," leaving one with the implication "that what is good for the social scientist as a researcher is good for the child or the adolescent as well" ("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, p. 357).

Another writer observed that although there "is a veritable hodge-podge of unrelated studies," often with some duplication, "great gaps remain." Further, "pressure and haste" have led to the failure "to build really adequate evaluation procedures" into the projects, especially in "the identification of basic social science generalizations." He was "also concerned with what seemed to be a tendency to develop materials that concentrate upon the average and above-average pupil," and "the seeming effort . . . to produce 'teacher-proof' materials and courses" which would "reduce the creative director of learning in the classroom to a mere technicial" ("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, pp. 357-8).

The Height of the Movement

Continuity and Change in Social Studies Education

By the mid-sixties there seemed to have been several approaches to social studies education competing for ascendancy. One approach was the status quo in the schools, which represented an evolved version of the 1916 prescription of the Committee on the Social Studies of the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The 1916 model had prescribed geography and European history at grade seven, United States history and "Community Civics" at grade eight, "Civics" and economics (including vocational opportunities) for grade nine, and for grades ten through twelve, European and English history (since 1700), United States history, and "Problems of American Democracy." By the 1960s, the 1916 model had been modified to: (7th) European history or some other history or civics; (8th) U.S. history, often emphasizing the period to 1865, (9th) civics or government or world geography; (10th) "world" history, usually European history and Western civilizations; (11th) U.S. history, often emphasizing 1865 to the present; and (12th) Problems of American Democracy, also called American Problems and Modern Social Problems, or U.S. government and a few electives such as Foreign Affairs or Modern Political Ideologies.

At the elementary school level, the pattern followed was the expanding human communities model--that is, the child in the family, in the school and neighborhood, the community, the state, etc. Usually, a

series of textbooks for kindergarten or first grade through grade six was published by each major publishing house and the whole series adopted by a school or school district as its elementary school social studies curriculum.

At both the elementary and secondary school levels, there was frequent use of current events magazines and "newspapers" which were subscribed to for the school year and mailed to schools on a weekly basis. Also, the single course textbook tended to be the only classroom material other than maps, globes, and the current events weekly.

Although there were these general patterns and sequences to the social studies curriculum in U.S. schools in the mid-sixties, many energetic and imaginative social studies teachers, district coordinators, and state supervisors developed other approaches to the social studies and even found time to create new materials. Such initiative and creativity, even in the face of time constraints and financial limitations, was not uncommon during this era. It was to these change agents in the schools and their counterparts in educational administration that two reform groups, and especially the NSS structures approach group, would have to direct their appeals to use the new materials and reform approaches.

It seems that every era in the history of social studies education in the United States in the twentieth century has been dominated by variants of this 1916 model, which is a "traditional," basically conservative, narrative, expository, history-as-the-core approach to social studies education. This approach emphasizes the transmission of *selected* aspects of the cultural heritage, which support the views of the dominant groups at the time and which foster nationalistic loyalties. It still exhibits, at any particular moment in history, considerable variation by region, state, community, school, and individual teacher.

In the mid-sixties there appears to have been, in addition to an evolved version of the 1916 model, two reform approaches in social studies education, though these two generally have been lumped together as the NSS reform movement.

The most easily recognized reform effort was the one most readily identified as the structures approach, emphasizing the structures of the disciplines of history and the social sciences. This reform thrust is

most readily characterized by the 15 points derived from the Fenton-Good article (see pp. 47-48). Except for the Harvard project, and perhaps one or two others, the major, national projects generally exemplified this reform approach, which is referred to in this paper as the "new social studies."

A second reform rationale that existed during the era of the NSS is one which has pervaded every period of social studies education in the twentieth century, distinct and significant despite its minority position. It can be traced back to two key works of John Dewey: *How We Think* (1910) and *Democracy and Education* (1916). The essence of its rationale is: (1) that social studies education in a democratic society should focus on those critical, though non-transient, problems or issues current in the society and which all citizens will have to face and attempt to solve; and (2) that the method of dealing with the crucial problems and issues should be the methods of intelligence, that is, reflective thinking, critical thinking, problemsolving, policy formation, and decision-making. During the 1950s and 1960s, advocates of this problem/processes approach included Maurice Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf (1955, 1968), Shirley Engle (1960, pp. 301-4), Byron Massialas and Benjamin Cox (1966), H. Gordon Hullfish and Phillip Smith (1961).

A separate branch of this second reform effort grew out of the seminal work of Harvard's Donald Oliver and the elaborations and extensions of his rationale by three of his doctoral students: James Shaver, Harold Berlak, and Fred Newmann. It appears to be mere historical coincidence that Oliver's thinking and work became noticed, and then funded by USOE, at about the same time as the NSS movement (that is, the structures approach) also was being launched.

The rationale for the Harvard Social Studies Project has been termed the "juris-prudential, case-study approach," the "analysis of public controversy approach," or the "analysis of public issues approach." It is a legal-ethical rationale based on the root values which support the legal framework of American society. Students deal with problems, usually presented as real or fictional case studies, where conflicts exist within the individual, between individuals, or between groups. The suggested problem areas are those which will probably persist in the

society for some time, are significant to the social welfare of the society, and will impinge on the present and future lives of students. Problem areas which meet these three criteria include racial/ethnic relations, religious/ideological differences, socioeconomic class differences and wealth distribution, and national security issues. The processes taught to students for the analysis of public controversies are critical or reflective thinking, value analysis, and choice. Further explanations of the Harvard school of thought are found in the writings of Oliver (Oliver and Shaver, 1966), Shaver and Berlak (1968), Newmann (1970), and Shaver and Larkins (1973).

In addition to the two distinct reform streams, there were also those who sought small additions to, modifications of, and deletions from the, then dominant variant of the 1916 social studies curriculum. During the era of the NSS, this group sought such "reforms" as the use of overhead projector transparencies, programmed instruction, behaviorally stated instructional and learning objectives, and 8 mm single concept film.

At mid-decade, then, there existed a mainstream social studies curriculum, two distinct reform rationales, and a potpourri of quasi-reforms.

The Projects and Inservice Education

By the first months of 1966, the NSS project staffs were well on the way to producing their first units and courses, or were already engaged in the process of fieldtesting the new materials, or, in the case of Lawrence Senesh, had already published part of a first edition (Senesh 1964). At the same time, many of the NSS project directors were becoming concerned about the problems of publication and of diffusion, the latter including dissemination of information and sample materials, piloting the new curricula in selected schools or classrooms, and implementation (or installation or adoption or adaptation) of a new curriculum in an entire school district.

Prior to completion and final revisions of new curricula, some projects had already contracted with particular publishers for rights to publish the new materials. Most of these contracts were either three-party or four-party contracts, where the parties concerned were: (1) the

publisher, (2) the federal government (USOE or NSF), (3) the agency, non-profit corporation, or university which was the grantee for developing the product, and (4) the author or authors. Some projects circulated, on their own initiative or in response to requests from the field, sample and experimental versions of portions of the new curricula, usually single lessons or at the most a unit. Most of this pre-publication material was of the spirit master or stencil variety, but in the case of the Carnegie Institute of Technology project (Fenton and Good), the publisher, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, prepared for free distribution several sample lessons--student readings and lesson plans--each in a separate little booklet with black glossy cover and labeled "experimental."

Also at about this time, NSS project directors and other leaders in social studies education began to turn some attention to the tasks of preparing teachers, and later parents and others, for the introduction of the new materials and courses. Many project directors and other writers for several years had been expressing the need for modifications in preservice and inservice teacher education programs in order to prepare teachers for new content, materials, and teaching strategies. Social studies educators had been made aware of these teacher education needs by leaders in the earlier science and mathematics curriculum reform movements.

One social studies curriculum developer, Hilda Taba, noted that the anticipated changes "were profound enough to cause a serious gap between what teachers are now doing or can now do and what is expected of them." Taba argued that the burden of attempting to close the gap must be borne by inservice education. The sources of the gap, Taba claimed, were:

1) the "effort to redefine the role of knowledge in curriculum by searching out what is called the 'structure' of these subjects or disciplines," by which is meant "basic concepts, basic generalizations, and specific examples of areas of content and specific descriptive information concerning these areas,"

2) the "emphasis on cognitive processes," on both the nature of thinking and the developmental stages of cognitive growth in children and adolescents,

3) the recognition that teachers will need "to reorganize knowledge in many different ways to serve at once the requirements of the logic of the subject and to accommodate the objective of thinking and the variations in the capacities of a heterogeneous student population,"

4) an expanded concept of the act of teaching, "that teaching involves the necessity of integrating a complex set of criteria and requirements," and

5) the emphasis on discovery and inquiry learning by students which calls for "inductive" methods by teachers, a "shift from an expository style of teaching to an heuristic one," which "requires a comfortable competence in content background, a facility in organizing specific information on the spot, security in the role of guiding thought," and an "understanding of the developmental sequences of mental operations" (Taba 1965, pp. 464-76).

Taba's analysis of the needs for inservice education of social studies teachers in light of the complexity of demands on teaching created by the NSS was undoubtedly more comprehensive and more accurate than most project directors would have imagined or admitted at the time. Nevertheless, virtually all NSS project directors agreed on the necessity for some inservice education (some called it re-education or re-training) in order to assure effective use of the new materials.

One ardent proponent of combining inservice education with the ongoing efforts of curriculum materials development was Edwin Fenton. In 1966, Fenton admonished his fellow historians not only to help develop "a wide range of materials devised for a variety of objectives and student audiences at all grade levels," but, in addition, to "suggest criteria by which teachers can decide which of the new materials, if any, to select for their students," to make their college classes models of disciplined, knowledgeable, and imaginative teaching, to make the NDEA institutes they staff a blend of content, new materials, and new teaching methods, and to "recognize work with the schools as the equivalent of traditional scholarly research . . ." (Fenton 1966, pp. 325-8). Some hundreds of social studies teachers attended inservice conferences of one to three days, summer institutes of two to eight weeks, or experienced teacher fellowship programs of nine to twelve months at Carnegie-Mellon University

under the tutelage of Fenton and members of his staff. Fenton was also in addition, one of the first to publish textbooks for use in college teacher education programs, especially the social studies methods course (Fenton 1967b).

The First Published Products

During the years 1964 to 1967, the earliest products of the NSS projects were published. At first, there was only a trickle of new materials, such as the 1964 Senesh *Our Working World* materials for grades one through three (Senesh 1964) and the early Amherst history paperback series (Halsey and Brown 1964-65). In 1966, a number of books appeared which were designed as NSS methods textbooks for use with preservice and inservice social studies teachers. Among these were the Fenton "inductive approach" (Fenton 1966), the Oliver and Shaver (1966) rationale for the Harvard Social Studies Project, the analysis of inquiry teaching and learning by Massialas and Cox (1966), the first conference report of the Social Science Education Consortium on "concepts and structure" (Morrissett 1967), and a volume by Clements and others (1966) on inquiry in the elementary school social studies curriculum.

Then, in 1967, both NSS curriculum materials and theoretical works which dealt with one or more aspects of the NSS came on the market. Early in the year, the first products from ACSP appeared: *An Annotated Bibliography of Anthropological Materials for High School Use* (Gallagher 1967); *The Idea of Liberty in American Culture* (Hanvey 1967); *The Great Tree and the Longhouse: The Culture of the Iroquois* (Hertzberg 1967); *The Kiowas: Profile of a People* (Marriot 1967); and *Kiowa Years: A Study In Culture Impact* (Marriot 1968). Also in 1967, the Harvard project had its first series of twelve paperback booklets published by American Education Publications (Oliver and Newmann 1967).

The Fenton and Good project at Carnegie Institute of Technology had contracted with Holt, Rinehart and Winston to publish their entire grades 9-12 social studies curriculum. In 1967, several products from this project were published by Holt: (1) a series of brief experimental units (for example, *Government at Stoerpenberg Camp*); (2) a set of six teacher-training films showing Fenton teaching a class of bright ninth-graders;

and (3) an introduction to the many aspects of the NSS reform movement (Fenton 1967a, 1967b). Also from Holt in 1967 came a spinoff of the Amherst history group, a complete United States history course textbook organized to promote inquiry by use of primary source documents and key leading questions (Kownslar and Frizzle 1967).

A two-volume survey of the scope and activities of the NSS was developed by John Gibson and his staff at the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs of Tufts University. These two paperbacks formed one of the most comprehensive statements of the nature of the NSS movement to appear in the sixties (Gibson 1967a and 1967b).

By the close of 1967, a rather extensive literature of the NSS existed and the number of national curriculum materials development projects had, by Gibson's count increased to over 50 (Gibson 1967b). The USOE alone had funded 58 projects, not all of which were to develop curriculum materials (*Directory of Social Studies...* 1967, pp. 509-10) and the NSF had funded six curriculum materials development projects (Gibson 1967a; *Directory of Social Studies...*, p. 511). Further, federal funds were then available for the inservice education of social studies teachers along lines consistent with the spirit of the NSS reform movement and the nature of the new curriculum materials. Funding for such activities was authorized under legislation concerning NSF activities and under acts administered by USOE: NDEA, Cooperative Research Program, and Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Continuing Critique

An effective critique of the NSS began with the Robinson article in 1963 (Robinson 1963) and continued with the reactions to reports on Project Social Studies in 1965 ("Reactions to the Reports..." 1965, pp. 356-60). In 1966, the critique was extended with the publication of Mark Krug's article, "Bruner's New Social Studies: A Critique" (Krug 1966, pp. 400-6). Focusing on Bruner's ideas in *The Process of Education* (Bruner 1960) and *On Knowing* (Bruner 1962), Krug challenged their applicability to the development of a social studies curriculum. First, he doubted that Burner's examples of structure and organizing concepts taken primarily from mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology have as powerful counterparts

in history and the social sciences. Especially in the discipline of history, Krug observed that "the few historians who have tried to find some order, rhythm, or structure in history have done so with limited success and usually without the endorsement of their fellow historians" (Krug 1966, pp. 400-6). Further, Krug doubted the existence of any "logical ladder of progression" in the study of history and the social sciences (Krug 1966, p. 411).

Krug pointed out other difficulties with the structures approach. He asked: "Would not the teaching of the broad concepts and generalizing principles, even if taught by inventive teachers by the inductive 'discovery' method recommended by Bruner, prove to be boring for many students during the long stretch of the school year?" (Krug 1966, p. 401). Krug quoted a question previously posed by Newmann: "Why should a general lay population be taught to perform intellectual operations of a nature preferred uniquely by the academic profession? That is, why should all children be taught to ask and answer the kinds of questions that interest historians, political scientists, economists, etc.?" (Krug 1966, pp. 401-2; Newmann 1965, p. 414). Even if the structures approach could be justified as general education, Krug noted that there are many viable structures in each social science discipline, that social science disciplines borrow freely from each other, that no integrating scheme or super-structure encompassing all the social sciences and history exists, and that there is "reluctance, if not outright opposition of most historians and of many social scientists, to a reductionist synthetic unification" (Krug 1966, p. 402).

In regard to the identification and use of a list of generalizations from history and the social sciences as the foundation of a social studies curriculum, Krug labeled many of these generalizations "obvious and even trite" (Krug 1966). In regard to "doing" mathematics or science, Krug wondered what the equivalent "doing" would be in history. Isn't the analogy between history and physics false if not misleading (Krug 1966, p. 404)? Finally, in regard to the de-emphasis of chronological narrative history and the cutting of time devoted to United States history, Krug issued a plea "in defense of the teaching of American history as deserving a place of importance in the schooling of young Americans" (Krug 1966, p. 405).

The critique of the NSS was extended into 1967 by Robert Jewett and Robert Ribble, who perceptively noted that "this excitement over the social studies is not a new phenomenon," and that "the assumption that a resolution of the conflict will emerge out of the present excitement seems unwarranted from past experience" (Jewett and Ribble 1967, p. 20). They found Galbraith's idea "of a cyclical process in which a 'conventional wisdom' is established, declines and falls in crisis, and is then replaced by a new 'conventional wisdom'" to be ". . . deceptively alluring when used to explain the history of the social studies" (Jewett and Ribble 1967, p. 20).

To Jewett and Ribble, "many of the conflicts that exist within the social studies area . . . are the result of the pluralism of the American culture . . ." (Jewett and Ribble 1967, p. 20). They worried that "the advent of nationally packaged curricular materials," combined with the prestige of scholars and universities, would pose a threat to the professional autonomy and status of classroom teachers; that should the road of "revolution" be taken instead of the way of "evolution," the teacher would become a mere functionary, a technician manipulating "teacher-proof" materials and settings (Jewett and Ribble 1967, p. 21).

These two authors considered the major problem of the NSS to be "how to maximize the effectiveness of the national curriculum projects without eroding the status of the classroom teacher." Their answers to the problem were: (1) viewing the NSS as evolutionary, because revolutionary change "implies an externally created and authoritatively introduced 'new' curriculum"; (2) maintaining "teacher control of the innovation procedures"; and (3) designing project materials which lend themselves to adaptation (Jewett and Ribble 1967, p. 22).

In February 1967 Jack Allen assessed recent developments in the social studies (Allen 1967, pp. 99-103). He repeated many of the earlier criticisms of the NSS: that, except for the Minnesota project, the national project directors were little concerned "with the total scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum"(Allen 1967, pp. 99-103); that "the social studies program is fashioned from a loose federation of social sciences, each discipline seeking what it regards as its proper role"; and that "to rationalize the conflicting claims" of the social sciences "into a balanced

curriculum" is not easy and may even be "virtually impossible" (Allen 1967, pp. 99-103). He went beyond these criticisms to note that the NSS projects had neglected the affective domain of attitudes, values, and feelings; that little research on comparative performance was available to justify inquiry and discovery approaches; that the projects were paying little attention to the new, heavier responsibilities being placed on teachers and on preservice and inservice teacher education programs; that too few of the projects focused on curricula for the elementary school, especially for the primary grades; and that evaluation, both formative and summative, was being neglected or merely given lip service (Allen 1967, pp. 99-103).

A major portion of the May 1967 *Social Education* was devoted to a symposium on "learning by induction," or what Bruner had called discovery learning. The lead article, to which four writers reacted and responded, was authored by Stephenie Edgerton. After having pursued the logic and description of the process of scientific inductive thinking, Edgerton reflected that "substituting the method of the researcher for his product appears unnecessary unless an assumption is being made that the method of the scholar is appropriate for decision making, both personal and public" (Edgerton 1967, p. 376). She wondered if perhaps social studies educators who advocated the ways of science as a means for preparing students for citizenship had "confused a method of inquiry seemingly appropriate for the validation of knowledge claims with a method appropriate for policy making" (Edgerton 1967, p. 376).

The dialogue between critics and advocates of the NSS occupied center stage in *Social Education* during 1967. In November, there appeared an article which has worn well with age and which now is a classic statement. What the author, James Shaver, called for was a redefinition of the social studies. Among the broad fields in the public school curriculum, "it would be difficult," said Shaver, "to find an area where word usage has introduced more confusion and frustration than in the discussion of the social studies curriculum." He noted that traditionally "the term *social studies* has . . . been defined in reference to the social sciences." The social sciences, "defined as the scholarly fields of study of man in his social environment," are assumed to be the

foundations of the social studies curriculum. Thus, the social studies are a loose federation of the social sciences "adapted and synthesized for pedagogical purposes"(Shaver 1967, p. 588).

For Shaver, this conception of social studies inhibits "creative curriculum work" by restricting the sources of content selection to the spectrum of history and the social sciences. For example, social studies educators generally assume that the noun-subject social studies is plural in nature, to be followed by a plural verb-predicate as in "The social studies are . . ." What completes this sentence is a listing of subjects or disciplines which are considered inclusive of the social sciences. In other words, one's conception of social studies must proceed solely from one's conception of history and the social sciences. Since history and the social sciences, as academic disciplines, are concerned with adequate description and/or scientific control and prediction, these disciplines offer little to the social studies curriculum in the domains of "thought process concepts," decision making skills, feelings and attitudes, and value conflicts and commitments (Shaver 1967, pp. 588-9).

Shaver offered what he considered "a more viable definition" of social studies "based on the long-standing commitments to citizenship education." His definition began "with the clear recognition that *social studies education is general education*"; that is, a curriculum of required courses for all students, and not solely for those continuing on to college or those who have interest in history or one or more of the social sciences. If social studies is primarily general education, its rationale should be derived from the nature of the democratic society in which students are and will be participating citizens. If the root values underlying American society are human dignity and rational consent, the social studies curriculum should be constructed on these twin pillars of a democratic society. Thus, Shaver concluded that social studies *is* "that part of the school's general education program which is concerned with tne preparation of citizens for participation in a democratic society" (Shaver 1967, pp. 588-9).

Given this definition of social studies, curriculum developers need to ask "What are the prerequisites of intelligent political participation?" In contrast, virtually all NSS curriculum developers asked "What do social

scientists or historians consider to be the legitimate domains of knowledge?" Shaver was quick to point out that his definition did not neglect or omit historical or social science content, but made the selection and organization of such content dependent upon the integrity of the goal of "intelligent participant citizens" rather than the goal of maintaining the integrity of any single academic discipline (Shaver 1967, p. 589).

What the goal of the "intelligent participant citizen" led to, in Shaver's thinking, was a social studies curriculum focused on the analysis of contemporary political-ethical controversies by use of reflective and critical thinking processes. He was not so naive, however, as to believe that such a departure from the conventional wisdom in social studies education could be easily achieved. He expected few of the national NSS projects "to produce rationales or materials appropriate to a definition of social studies clearly and explicitly based on citizenship education." Three exceptions noted were the Harvard project, the Sociological Resources for the Social Studies Project, and Shaver's own project at Utah State University (Shaver 1967, pp. 590-2, 596). Furthermore, he saw dismal prospects, given "the present curricular climate of structure and induction," for the widespread acceptance of "education for rational citizenship." Then, in a particularly bitter lament, Shaver ended the article with this sentence: "For, contrary to our assumptions, the intense involvement of a citizenry effectively schooled and interested in the analysis of public issues might be too disruptive to our society" (Shaver 1967, p. 596).

The Rude Intrusions

Paradoxically, a predominantly young group of citizens, who by and large were *not* schooled in the analysis of public issues, *did* disrupt our society--severely, seriously and significantly. During the five-year period, 1968 to 1972, young anti-war and civil rights groups not only disrupted American society, but reawakened its citizenry to the ancient, root values and ideals upon which the nation was founded. For the young to invoke the American creed in opposition to war, to racism and sexism, and to environmental and human degradation, however, could only lead to open conflict with those of the older generation who wielded power and who

made national policies. And among the primary arenas in which the conflicts and crises occurred were those where the young spent most of their lives--in the homes, schools, colleges and universities of America. And it was in these environments also where most of the leaders of the NSS played out their roles as project directors or staff members, *and* as parents, teachers, and professors. There can be little doubt that the events of these agonizing years cast some long shadows over the work of the NSS projects, and at the least drew attention to the political and ethical dimensions of curriculum development in social education. It seems that it would have taken extraordinary willpower in those days for anyone in social studies education to have remained unaffected by or to have ignored the fury of societal events. Perhaps for many the psychological device of compartmentalization was employed to separate their experiences into personal and professional categories, and thus to avoid resolution of inner conflicts and inconsistencies.

The Zenith of the NSS Movement

It appears that the year 1967 was the time when the NSS movement reached its zenith. This was the year when the largest number of funded national projects were in existence. It was the year that *Social Education* contained the most articles, comments, and letters related to NSS issues. It was the year that saw the NCSS annual convention inundated with section meetings devoted to NSS projects and topics. It was the next to last year of the Johnson administration, which had pumped hundreds of millions of dollars via HEW and NSF into research, curriculum materials development, and inservice education. For most of the NSS projects which had been funded initially in 1964 or earlier, 1967 was the last or next to last year for materials development. For these projects, the years after 1967 would be spent dealing with such concerns as publication, diffusion, and teacher education.

In 1968, much of the time and energy of the staffs of NSS projects were spent in diffusion and teacher education activities. In addition to project staffs, many other social scientists and social studies educators joined the NSS movement as directors and staff members of NDEA and NSF institutes. Most of these institutes focused inservice education on both

new background knowledge in history and the social sciences *and* on NSS project curriculum materials and teaching strategies. USOE, in 1968, approved 132 NDEA summer institutes in history and the social sciences, intended to accommodate 5200 teacher participants ("NDEA..." 1968, pp. 153-6). NSF supported far fewer social science summer institutes, and these were predominantly in anthropology, economics, geography, and sociology. All NSF institutes and most NDEA institutes ignored the needs of elementary school teachers and did not encourage their attendance as institute participants.

The High School Geography Project (HSGP) had devoted the years 1961 to 1967 to the preparation, fieldtesting, and revision of a year-long geography course. The Macmillan Company published the HSGP course during 1969 and 1970. After 1967, and even beyond the last year of NSF funding, 1970, the HSGP director and staff elevated dissemination and inservice teacher education activities to top priorities. HSGP even developed three teacher education kits in 1969 for use in preservice and inservice programs. These kits incorporated selected activities from the high school course, *Geography in an Urban Age*, to serve as exemplars of specific teaching strategies. For example, "The Game of Farming" and "Portsville" served as exemplars of simulation games and simulations respectively, and were frequent referents for generalizing about teaching and learning by use of games and simulations (Patton 1970).

The HSGP staff utilized at least two types of conference/workshop formats for dissemination and inservice teacher education purposes. "In 1967, 1968, and 1970, a series of briefing conferences were held which included directors of summer geography institutes, social studies coordinators from various school districts, and teachers of teachers." The conferences were designed to familiarize participants with HSGP curriculum materials and to encourage conferees to use the materials in their own teacher education programs, both preservice and inservice. "Participants were involved in selected activities from project materials," and then analyzed possible uses of these materials in their own teacher education programs (Patton 1970, p. 47).

The other type of format evolved from work with leadership teams. A team varied in size from five to 15 members, all from the same school

district locale, and included social studies teachers, social studies department chairmen, a district social studies coordinator or supervisor, and a social studies methods professor from a nearby college or university. Teams worked through selected HSGP activities, did some microteaching to peers or to volunteer high school students, studied the rationale, philosophy, and teacher's guides for HSGP, and finally designed a team plan for implementing on a pilot or full-scale basis HSGP in the team's home district. The plan also included arrangements for teacher inservice courses (Patton 1970, p. 47).

The HSGP staff developed a number of products used to disseminate information about the project. These included: (1) the *Newsletter*, with 19 issues from 1962 to 1970; (2) news releases to the media; (3) a 16 mm film, "High School Geography: New Insights"; (4) 16 hours of unedited videotape showing parts of HSGP being taught in high school classrooms, and five hours of edited videotape illustrating the advantages and problems of using HSGP; (5) a sampler, demonstration kit which served as an overview of HSGP; and (6) position papers, brochures, advertisements, and journal articles (Patton 1970, pp. 52-5).

Although often belatedly, most NSS projects provided for some types of diffusion and teacher education activities; an exception was the SRSS project. Most projects developed a few special products for these purposes. Those projects which seem to have given the most attention to dissemination and inservice education were HSGP, the Carnegie Institute of Technology project, Education Development Center's Social Studies Program, especially for *Man: A Course of Study*, the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, and Hilda Taba's Contra Costa County/San Francisco State College project.

A Second Wave of NSS Projects

From 1968 to 1972, a second wave of national NSS projects came into existence. Among these were the following:

1) Biomedical Interdisciplinary Curriculum Project, Social Science Program, Berkeley, CA; Director of Project, Leonard Hughes; Director of Social Science Program, William M. Hering, Jr.; funded by NSF; 1968-1978.

2) "People and Technology," Education Development Center (EDC), Cambridge, MA; Director, Ruth Macdonald; funded by EDC and USOE, 1969-1975.

3) "Exploring Human Nature," EDC, Cambridge, MA; Directors, Anita Gil, Irven DeVore, and George Goethals; funded by NSF, 1970-1975.

4) Human Sciences Program, BSCS, Boulder, CO; Director, James T. Robinson; funded by NSF, 1972-1977.

5) "Comparing Political Experiences," Indiana University; Directors, Judith A. Gillespie, Howard Mehlinger, and John Patrick; funded by NSF, 1972-1977. (Lockard n.d.)

Also during the same period, a number of curriculum materials development projects which related to social studies, especially in terms of contemporary social issues with scientific, technological, and socio-economic aspects, came on the scene. Examples of such projects are the following:

1) Student Assisted Development of Materials for Environmental and Social Studies (SADMESS), SSEC, Boulder, CO; Directors, Irving Morrissett and Suzanne Wiggins Helburn; funded by USOE, 1971-1972.

2) "Technology-People-Environment," Engineering Concepts Curriculum Project, State University of New York at Stony Brook; Directors, John G. Truxal and Emil J. Piel; funded by NSF, Exxon, and U.S. Steel, 1970- .

3) Huntington Two Computer Project (H_2); State University of New York at Stony Brook; Director, Ludwig Braun; funded by NSF, 1968-1974.

4) Unified Science and Mathematics for Elementary Schools (USMES), EDC, Cambridge, MA; Director, Earle L. Lomon; funded by NSF, 1970-1977. (Lockard n.d.)

Of these four examples, the first is primarily a social studies project focused on the environmental quality issue; the second is primarily a science/technology/engineering project, also focused on the environmental issue; the third is primarily a mathematics and science project focused on simulations and games, which calls for the use of digital computers, and in which some of the simulations/games are based on social issues; and the fourth is a multi-disciplinary (science, social science, and mathematics) project focused on long-range investigations of real and practical problems, some of which are basically social problems.

The NSS reformers remained active on several fronts in the years 1968 to 1972. Some projects had completed their materials development work by 1968, and already had published products on the market. These reformers were then more able to concentrate on dissemination and inservice education efforts than they had been during development, field-testing, and revision. This was true for the Fenton group at Carnegie-Mellon University, although they also were involved in a new slow learner project, and a second generation of NSS projects, which might be called the *New* New Social Studies. The Amherst history project also was involved at this time in producing a second generation of materials.

A second group of projects had completed all development and revision work, but had difficulty finding publishers for their products or could find only small houses. In this group were Edith West's USOE-funded Minnesota materials, some of which were eventually rewritten and made available as "The Family of Man" kits from SEE, Selective Educational Equipment; and the Boston Children's Museum Match Box Project, funded by USOE, which had three of its unit kits--"Japanese Family," "A House of Ancient Greece," and "The City" published by American Science and Engineering, Inc., of Boston.

A third group of projects was engaged simultaneously in final field trials, revising units, negotiating with publishers, disseminating information, and conducting conferences and inservice workshops. The HSGP was characteristic of this group at this time. To a lesser extent, ACSP was engaged in most of these activities.*

Newly formed and funded projects comprised a fourth group. These NSS projects (and related inter- or multi-disciplinary projects) generally added two new dimensions to the predominantly structural approach which characterized earlier NSS projects. The new added dimensions were: (1) the use of selected, contemporary social problems as study topics and, thus, as criteria for the selection of historical and social science content; and (2) the analysis of the nature of students, as comprising diverse types, manifesting a variety of learning and cognitive growth processes and

*See almost the entire issue of *Social Education* for February 1968, (Vol. 32, No 2), which dealt with anthropology in general and ACSP in particular.

stages--an emphasis which serves to focus the attention of curriculum developers on students as differentiated client groups. One project which took both of these dimensions as focal points was SSEC's SADMESS project. BSCS' Human Sciences Program, relying heavily on the work of Jean Piaget, exemplified attention to the client dimension. The Indiana University's Comparing Political Experiences project incorporated many current social problems as vehicles for analyzing political behaviors and structures.

Finally, a fifth group of NSS reformers was made up of non-project social studies educators who labored in the field, in preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Some were secondary school social studies department chairmen; others were school district social studies coordinators; another subgroup was the state social studies supervisors; and then there were the few "converts" who were social science or education professors in colleges and universities. The conferences, workshops, courses, and programs conducted by this group were sponsored and financially supported by USOE (NDEA and EPDA programs) and NSF (summer institutes, cooperative college/school science programs, resource personnel workshops, academic year institutes, leadership development projects, and leadership workshops), by state departments of education, and by local school districts.

If 1967 marked the peak of momentum, activity, healthy criticism, and enthusiasm in the NSS reform movement, the following four or five years can be represented by a plateau at a lower level, where change strategies and activities received somewhat more attention and funds than curriculum materials development. It was also during this period that the edge of the structures approach became dulled by the press of events in the broader arenas of national and world affairs.

The profession came rather slowly to the recognition that, among others, its priorities should include the concerns of its clients, the problems faced by the society which supports it, and the moral/ethical dilemmas interwoven in all the human social situations it selects for curricular content.

Outcomes

Appraisals of the NSS Projects

After 1967 and through December 1972, less and less space in issues of *Social Education* was devoted to the NSS projects, either descriptive or critical pieces. Every few months, however, an advertisement appeared announcing the new publication of the products of a NSS project. And two issues of *Social Education* did devote substantial space to the NSS--April 1970 and November 1972.

The April 1970 issue of *Social Education* was devoted almost exclusively to "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects" by Sanders and Tanck (1970, pp. 383-449). The authors stated that although they had originally intended "to appraise all instructional materials offered by the national social studies projects," this quickly became recognized as an impossible task because there were well over 100 projects, some of which "had no materials ready for review." They pointed out that the most comprehensive, up-to-date directory of NSS projects had been prepared by Sidney Lester's Marin County, California, Social Studies Project, and that the Marin group had identified and abstracted over 100 projects and could have included many more (Sanders and Tanck 1970, p. 384).

Sanders and Tanck categorized the 26 selected projects as "comprehensive, discipline-oriented, area-oriented, or special purpose." They also identified projects as "complete, self-sufficient courses" or as "intended for integration as parts of a course"(Sanders and Tanck 1970, p. 384). They reported that "a number of general trends and shared characteristics can be seen in the projects." Some of these were:

1) ". . . greater emphasis on ideas and methodology from anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and social psychology; history and geography . . . have become less dominant as the subject matter of the social studies";

2) ". . . an interdisciplinary, integrated approach to curriculum development; . . . ideas and methodology from other discipline-oriented courses";

3) use of structure, "patterns of concepts and generalizations," methodologies of disciplines, and "discovery or inquiry teaching strategies";

4) some "concern for values";

5) encouragement of students to develop "creative, subjective, and divergent" thinking patterns;

6) some use of "cross-cultural studies" and area studies (for example, Africa and Asia);

7) in-depth rather than general and cursory study of topics;

8) "a greater variety of materials";

9) use of "background readings for teachers and detailed lesson plans"; and

10) use of a research and development process, including field trials and revisions (Sanders and Tanck 1970, pp. 384-7).

These authors also offered a few cautions about uncritical adoption of NSS materials. Quoting one NSS project staff member, it was observed that although all projects "invite students to inquire into a body of evidence . . . with increasing frequency the feedback . . . from teachers who are using these materials in their classes is that a noticeable portion of students are turning the invitations down cold or are best reluctant guests at the banquet tables of inquiry and discovery" (Sanders and Tanck 1970, p. 388). Another writer who was quoted commented that she had learned "that what appeals to an adult may seem either too obvious or too obscure to an eighth grader," and that it was quite difficult "to devise ways in which the materials would induce student interest, but also *not* lead the student to an inevitable answer"(Sanders and Tanck 1970, p. 388).

Following their project descriptions and critical analyses, Sanders and Tanck presented their advice to those who must construct social studies curricula for local school districts. They noted that it is now "increasingly possible to buy a variety of ready-made curricula that fit the philosophy selected" by local social studies educators, but this will result in more expensive social studies programs than those based on the single course textbook. Other added expenses will be for teacher time to select materials, build courses, prepare to teach the new materials, and

introduce them to other teachers. Some of their other comments were: (1) that "efficiency and economy in using the complex new social studies curricula" at the elementary school level may lead to greater departmentalization as contrasted with the "self-contained classroom"; (2) that the "subject-centered" orientation of the NSS projects may leave a void in "pupil-centered" affective areas such as attitudes and feelings; (3) that many NSS projects de-emphasize evaluation, and thus "there may be a swing away from using tests as a means of extrinsic motivation"; and (4) that too many NSS projects "best serve the bright, college-bound students" (Sanders and Tanck 1970, pp. 447-9).

Another analysis of NSS projects was conducted two years later in the November 1972 issue of the same journal ("New In-Depth Evaluations..." 1972, pp. 711-73). The SSEC directors and staff were responsible for the new analyses and for most of the articles in this "Special Issue." Readers of this issue, in addition to appraisals of 26 NSS projects, were introduced to "the NCSS's [1971] *Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines* and the SSEC's *Curriculum Materials Analysis System*. The 26 projects SSEC chose to analyze included most but not all those Sanders and Tanck analyzed (Haley 1972, pp. 718-9).

In this issue, Haley observed that "although the curriculum reform movement of the 1960s is said by many to be over, it should be noted that there are many projects still under development" (Haley 1972, p. 219). As a matter of fact, there were in 1976 still a few second generation NSS projects still in existence; for example, the "Comparing Political Experiences" project directed by Gillespie and Patrick at Indiana University.

In the SSEC overview of the project analyses, they indicated the categories and criteria used to make appraisals. The social studies subject areas included were anthropology, American history, area studies, civics/government, economics, geography, interdisciplinary social studies, law, multidisciplinary social studies, psychology, problems of democracy, public issues, political science, sociology, urban studies, and world history. The "format" categories were multi-year, one year, one semester, a unit, and a supplement. From the NCSS *Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines* (1971), they used these selected criteria: contemporary focus,

cultural, racial, and/or ethnic focus, value conflicts, flexibility, variety of media, variety of learning activities, active involvement of student, and active involvement of teacher ("Overview of the Project..." 1971, pp. 853-69; NCSS Task Force 1971a).

The November 1972 *Social Education* was the last issue of this journal to devote extended treatment to NSS *projects*. Discussions of NSS topics, however, were carried at intervals from 1972 to 1976. Such topics as inquiry and concepts and generalizations continued to capture interest.

Emerging Trends in Social Studies: 1968 to 1972

While the appeal of the NSS seemed to wane from 1968 to 1972, several new trends began to emerge. One trend was the awakening of a heightened social consciousness in social studies educators in response to the war in Vietnam and to violence and racism at home. For some, this concern extended to participation in a variety of forms of social protest and activism. A second trend, related in many ways to the first, was an increased concern in social education for the place of values and valuing. A final trend, in part stimulated by the NSS, was the increased availability of a plethora of diverse classroom materials in a variety of media formats.

Evidence that social studies educators were becoming concerned, if not active, about Vietnam, violence, and racism is difficult to locate and document, and is often more implicit than explicit. In 1969, for example, in the November issue of *Social Education,* devoted entirely to articles on Asia, the following poem appeared twice, once in an article by Crown, "Voices from Asia," and again on a page obviously inserted by the journal editor:

WHO AM I?

by Tru Vu (Vietnam, contemporary)

Translated from the Vietnamese by Nguyen Ngoc Bich

I am neither a communist
nor a nationalist:
I am a Vietnamese.
Is it not enough?
For thousands of years

that's what I've been:
don't you think that's enough?
And Vietnam in flames
and mother who weeps
and youngsters who suffer
and all the terminology we use to kill each other!
O river
we stand on our respective banks
our fallen tears mingling. (Crown 1969, p. 802)

Then, more explicitly, the 1969 NCSS House of Delegates passed this resolution:

> Whereas: U.S. participation in the "Vietnam War" has developed into an immoral involvement in the affairs of an Asian nation,
>
> Whereas: the "Vietnam War" is destroying the positive image of the U.S. throughout the world,
>
> Be It Resolved That: The NCSS encourages the government of the U.S. to exert every effort to withdraw from military engagement in the Republic of Vietnam. (Minutes: 13th Delegate..." 1970, p. 471)

The NCSS Board of Directors approved a milder substitute resolution which described the United States presence in Vietnam as "interference" rather than "immoral involvement," which was "undermining" rather than "destroying" the positive image of the United States throughout the world ("Minutes: 13th Delegate..." 1970, p. 471). However one viewed the war, the issue was a hotly debated one for many NCSS members at this time.

Probably as a result of the Vietnam war and civil rights protests, but also because of generational conflicts over life styles, from 1968 onward to the present, social studies educators and curricula demonstrated increased concern for the development of personal and social values and for processes of valuing. This is not to say that social studies education in this century has ever totally ignored the role of values in individuals or society, but that in the late sixties and into the seventies values education became a more explicit, and perhaps for many an even dominant, aspect of social studies instruction.

As early as 1966, many social studies teachers found the Raths, Harmin, and Simon volume, *Values and Teaching*, a useful approach and rich resource for classroom valuing activities (Raths et al. 1966). In his

1969 presidential address to the NCSS annual meeting, Ronald Smith was prophetic in observing that "in recent years perhaps the forces in the cognitive fields have been strongest . . . ," to the extent that "we could no doubt designate the decade of the Sixties as the 'cognitive decade. I forecast that the decade of the Seventies will become the 'affective decade'" (Smith 1970, p. 194). Commenting on the implications for social studies educators of "The Kent State Tragedy," Kent State University professor Harris L. Dante reached the conclusion that "the value question is perhaps the most important and difficult problem to which social studies teachers need direct themselves" (Dante 1971, p. 358).

Yearbooks, bulletins, curriculum series, and special series published by NCSS are frequently excellent clues to what is *current* in the profession. In 1968, two special publications of NCSS were *Inquiry in the Social Studies* and *Structure in the Social Studies*, both indicative of the influence of the NSS at that time (Allen et al. 1968; Hebert and Murphy 1968). In 1971, however, two NCSS publications reflected a different focus for social education. These were the 1971 yearbook, *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies and Procedures*, and the second volume in the Crisis Series, *Values and Youth* (Metcalf 1971; Barr 1971). Clearly, one change from 1968 to 1971 was the slow demise of the NSS structures/inquiry approach and the emergence of other emphases, one of which was values education.

Partly as a result of the varied products of the NSS projects, partly also as a result of the relative affluence and presence of risk capital in the publishing industry, partly due also to increased income and spending power in local school districts, and, finally, in part due to new "hardware" technologies, there was an explosion of instructional media and materials for the social studies in the late sixties and early seventies. A few NSS projects produced media kits to accompany student materials or textbooks. The Carnegie-Mellon University/Holt, Rinehart and Winston media kits, for example, contained audio disc recordings, non-captioned "inquiry" filmstrips, pre-printed spirit masters, overhead projector transparency sets, most with overlay sequences, and a set of photo cards. The HSGP project, published by Macmillan included

a lego board, "Portsville," with lego pieces to represent homes, commercial buildings, public buildings, parks, railroads, etc., and several simulations (for example, "Metfab"). The *Patterns in Human Culture* project, also published by Macmillan, utilized overhead projector transparencies and overlays, audio records, simulated artifacts, and sound filmstrips.

MACOS (*Man: A Course of Study*), published by Curriculum Development Associates, relied heavily on 16 mm sound films. SRSS products (episodes, paperbacks, and a course), published by Allyn and Bacon, incorporated many games and simulations. *The Family of Man* kits, published by Selected Educational Equipment, included duplicates of artifacts from ancient and modern communities around the world.

In addition to the NSS projects' products, other authors and creators, some within publishing houses, developed games, simulation games, kits, multi-package curricula (for example, Holt, Rinehart and Winston's *Databank* elementary school social studies program), films, filmstrips (with and without accompanying sound), transparency sets, map transparencies, audio cassettes, film loops (which were sometimes called "single concept films"), photo collections, slide collections in carousels with audio cassettes or records, posters, and maps, globes, and assorted realia.

Then, finally, both from NSS projects and from others, came an unprecedented outpouring of printed materials, including hardbound textbooks, paper-bound textbooks, unit paperbacks, social issues paperback series, and readings collections.

Contemporary social problems and issues emerged, by 1968, as a high priority for social studies teachers and their students. This emphasis originated with the Harvard project's advocacy of the analysis of public controversy, in the late 1950s, and gained momentum from the John Kennedy assassination, civil rights marches, anti-war protests, the shocks of the Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy murders, and then from the youth, sex, and drug revolts. Within this curricular focus on social issues, a debate developed over how far students should go in dealing with these problems. Some social studies educators advocated personal/social *commitment and action* as the logical extensions of the investigative or inquiry process, while others insisted that academic *dialogue* and the drawing of *conclusions* were as far as social studies in the schools should go.

Articles in *Social Education* during the years 1968 to 1972 reveal the following as those crucial, contemporary social issues suggested for inclusion in social studies curricula:

1) racism and racial relations, Black and Afro-American history,
2) ethnicity and cultural pluralism; Mexican-American, Native American, and other ethnic groups' histories,
3) law and order, law/legal education
4) youth life styles and the drug culture
5) war and peace, conflict resolution, the Vietnam war,
6) environmental pollution and degradation,
7) overpopulation,
8) sexism and women's liberation,
9) global and future problems,
10) urbanization and urban problems.

For some of these problem topics, entire issues (or major portions of issues) of the journal were devoted to them. For example, the January 1971 issue (Vol. 35, No. 1) dealt with "The Environmental Crisis," while the April 1972 journal was on "Population Education."

The 1971 NCSS Curriculum Guidelines

Undoubtedly, one of the significant publications in social studies education in the twentieth century was the 1971 NCSS *Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines* (NCSS Task Force... 1971B). This statement reflects the diversity of rationales for social studies education. As a cohesive synthesis, however, it leaves many questions unanswered and fails to make several logical connections. What it did do, as far as the NSS is concerned, was to incorporate several thrusts of that movement in the position statement.

Briefly summarized, the *Guidelines* claim that social studies education "has a twofold purpose: enhancement of human dignity through learning and commitment to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end" (NCSS Task Force... 1971b, p. 7). These two goals subsume objectives in four domains: (1) knowledge, (2) abilities, (3) valuing, and (4) social participation. Collectively, these dual purposes and four domains of objectives form "A Basic Rationale for Social Studies Education."

The influence of the NSS can be found in the two domains of knowledge and abilities. In the knowledge area, there is mention of "structure," "concepts and generalizations," and "empirical inquiry"; while in the abilities realm appear such terms as "inquiry-oriented approaches" and "data processing skills" (NCSS Task Force... 1971b, p. 7). Clearly, as an attempt to reflect the state of the art in social studies, the *Guidelines* drew from a number of different and possibly conflicting rationales, one of which was that represented by the NSS.

The NSS Movement Withers

If 1967 represented the peak or summit of the NSS movement, and if the years 1968 to 1972 represented a lower plateau if not a gradual descent in the movement, in the period 1973 to 1976 the NSS trail became less and less discernible. To be sure, in 1976 there were several second generation projects still in operation: for example, the BSCS' Human Sciences Program, the American Psychological Association's project (Director, John Bare, Carleton College, Minnesota; funded by NSF), and the Comparing Political Experiences project at Indiana University. But, despite these instances, interest in the NSS structures and inquiry approach had ebbed and funds for social studies curriculum development were fast disappearing at both USOE and NSF.

As difficult as it was to determine when the NSS began, so it is with the ending of the movement. The NSS began to decline as a movement during 1968, especially in the face of dire social upheaval. As it was aided by Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" programs, so it was slowed by Nixon's new federalism and de-emphasis of social and educational reforms. The NSS quite accurately never expired, however, but gradually faded, and blended into other emerging interests and patterns.

By 1972, the NSS was submerged beneath other interests among social studies educators. Among these were contemporary social issues, career education, and values/moral education. From 1972 to 1976, whatever NSS projects still existed (for example, the *Comparing Political Experiences* project at Indiana University) were clearly at the periphery of concerns among social studies professionals. By 1976, there appeared to be no discernible, potentially long-term trends in social education. The profes-

sion was once again searching for direction, with the problems of definition of the social studies and of scope and sequence being raised anew.

Perspectives on the Movement

A decade ago, when the NSS movement had reached its apex, this observer forecast that "one could almost venture the prediction that the new social studies curricula will have been implemented, so as to be able to discern an accelerating trend, by the early 1970's" (Haas 1967, p. 59). It is difficult to determine, even today, the effects of this reform effort on classroom materials use and on student achievement. Summarizing three recent studies, all in the 1970s, which sought to determine the impact of the NSS, Gerald Marker concluded that "if there is one thing that stands out as one reviews these three studies, it is that a substanial proportion of the potential adopters of social studies innovations are still unaware of the major new alternatives that have been developed in the past decade" (Marker 1977). It appears, though evidence is scant, that widespread implementation (adoption or adaptation) of NSS curricula, courses, and units did not occur, that perhaps five percent of social studies classrooms in the United States were affected by the NSS, and that the greatest impact was on selected suburban schools.

One indicator of relative success for particular NSS products is the willingness of a publishing house to undertake a revision of the product. Revisions have been made or are now in progress for Senesh's *Our Working World*, HSGP's *Geography in an Urban Age*, and the Carnegie-Mellon University project's four-year high school curriculum. Clearly, sales from the first editions of these products justified revised versions.

If most social studies educators either ignored or rejected the products of the NSS movement, one reason was the failure or lack of diffusion efforts by project directors and other advocates. Yet even full-scale diffusion programs might have been unsuccessful, because, to many educators, the NSS movement was conceptually deficient.

One conceptual weakness was that the NSS rationale was uni-dimensional, that is, too committed to single answers to curriculum development questions. Listen to Philip Phenix, one of the philosophers of the "new" movements in science, mathematics, and social science:

> My thesis, briefly, is that *all* curriculum content should be drawn from the disciplines, or, to put it another way, that *only* knowledge contained in the disciplines is appropriate to the curriculum.
>
> This means that phychological needs, social problems, and any of a variety of patterns of material based on other than discipline content, are not appropriate to the determination of what is taught--though obviously such non-disciplinary considerations *are* essential to decisions about the *distribution* of discipline knowledge within the curriculum as a whole. (Phenix 1962, pp. 273-4)

Of the three basic sources of curriculum--nature of knowledge, nature of society, and nature of students and learning--the NSS movement chose to emphasize just one way of viewing the nature of knowledge, namely, the structures of the *separate* academic disciplines and the procedures used by practitioners of these disciplines as they created knowledge. The NSS was uni-dimensional in its emphasis on the structural aspects of history and the social sciences, to the neglect of the nature of students and the nature of society as sources of the social studies curriculum. It was uni-dimensional also in its emphasis on curriculum *materials*, to the neglect of school and classroom organization, of the nature of teachers, of the dynamics of teacher-student, student-student, and teacher-student-materials interactions, and of the nature of preservice and inservice teacher education.

In 1971, Bruner saw this uni-dimensional flaw:

> If I had my choice now, in terms of a curriculum project for the seventies, it would be to find a means whereby we could bring society back to its sense of values and priorities in life. *I believe I would be quite satisfied to declare, if not a moratorium, then something of a de-emphasis on matters that have to do with the structure of history, the structure of physics, the nature of mathematical consistency, and deal with it rather in the context of the problems that face us.* (Bruner 1971, p. 19)

A second weakness of the NSS was "thinking too small." By this is meant the tendency of projects to focus on a single academic discipline, and on single yearlong courses or units to be infiltrated into existing courses. Bob Taylor has observed that the NSS was "subject centered," which led to an increase in the number of disciplines offered and "the

treatment of each expanded," but "little has been done to meld these separate disciplines into a social studies program which provides a total unified education for the evolving individual" (Taylor 1974, p. 448). Another aspect of "thinking too small" was the tendency of all projects, except Edith West's at the University of Minnesota, to avoid planning for a K-12 sequence. Even the patron saint of the curriculum reform movements in the fifties and sixties, Jerome Bruner, wondered in 1971 if revision of curriculum was sufficient, "or was a more fundamental restructuring of the entire educational system in order?" (Bruner 1971, p. 19)

A third deficiency was an over-reliance on rationality. As Taylor put it, the NSS "ignored or minimized the position of values and valuing" (Taylor 1974, p. 448). Arthur Foshay also saw that the structure of the disciplines approach "is a strictly rational affair. It is naive to assume that all of the problems of the world can be solved by rational men being reasonable with one another" (Foshay 1970, p. 352). He further criticized the structures approach for its avoidance of "the relationship between education and life--what we call 'relevance'"; and for failing "to offer students the opportunity to become more than superficially acquainted with great public problems" (Foshay 1970, p. 351). If social studies is to help students deal with personal and social problems and issues, it cannot avoid the normative dimension inherent in controversy.

A fourth weakness was the neglect of individual differences--in students and in teachers. The NSS materials were designed for use in traditional classrooms where class-size-group instruction is the rule. The NSS products were intended for the use primarily of academically talented, college preparatory students. The NSS materials called for teaching strategies with which neither teachers nor teacher educators were familiar or competent.

In John Goodlad's opinion, "the discipline-centered movement . . . too often has overlooked the burgeoning interests of the child, many of which might have been picked up and used spontaneously" (Goodlad 1968, p. 105). Also neglected (except in BSCS' Human Sciences project) was the knowledge of cognitive development, especially the psychology of growth and maturation, of stage development, and of individual growth patterns.

Finally, there was a weakness of arrogance and myopia. This was the failure of the leaders of the NSS to do their homework, to presume nothing of value had been done or learned by curriculum workers who preceded them, to ignore the possibilities of historical precedents, to deny or ignore the wisdom of the past. This was a remarkable blindness, considering that these professionals were historians and social scientists.

What might have been unearthed from the history of curriculum movements is the knowledge that

> curriculum planning, like other human phenomena, suffers at any given time because of preoccupations that obscure other relevant emphases. But it is these over-emphases, too, that give socieities their innovative spurts and the individuals who spawn them their *raison d'être*. (Goodlad 1968, p. 98)

Thus, "excesses are the creative thrusts of individuals and of society, the counter-cyclical reactions to yesterday's excesses" (Goodlad 1968, p. 107). The early leaders of the Progressive Education movement were "child-centered" as a reaction to the extreme formalism with respect to knowledge and repression with respect to children's activity present at the turn of the century. The later Progressives, George S. Counts and the Reconstructionists, emphasized the need for the schools to take a position with respect to the reform of society--a reaction to the individualism of child-centered curricular approaches. Life Adjustment Education attempted to reconcile "child-centered" and "society-centered" approaches, but to the neglect of the changing nature of knowledge. The "Great Debate" of the early 1950s and the curriculum materials reform movements of the late fifties and sixties represented a re-emphasis on knowledge in reaction to the preceding eras' emphasis on student or society.

Another gem which the leaders of the NSS might have discovered is that educational reform movements never exist in isolation from or unaffected by events and attitudes in the culture and society of which the institution of education is a part. Macdonald, in analyzing social and intellectual influences on curriculum, observed that the process of curriculum is not "a simple rational one, but a complex political and ethical phenomenon . . ." It is

> a very complex and dynamic process . . . subject to historical tradition and tendencies, to diverse and sometimes contradicting cultural and social pressures, to the relation of insti-

> tutional and social living in the schools, and to the personalities and characteristics of those involved in the development and implementation of curricula (Macdonald 1971, p. 97).

Certainly the curriculum development process in the NSS was affected by such influences. The NSS reform efforts were sometimes enhanced, sometimes hindered, by such historical traditions as the acceptance of the 1916 committee's curricular pronouncements and the curriculum reform work in science and mathematics during the 1950s; and by such cultural and social pressures as the impact of Sputnik I and the series of assassinations, urban riots, civil rights demonstrations, and anti-war protests.

This writer risked these general observations in 1973:

> After more than a decade of ferment in the field of social studies education, the major thrust of the New Social Studies seems to be waning. In its wake, secondary school social studies curricula are in a state of "curriculum anarchy"; which is to say that local curriculum patterns are more varied than at any other time in this century. No longer is it possible to describe a typical state, regional or national pattern of social studies curriculum. Furthermore, it appears each junior or senior high school in a given school district is "doing its own thing." One can view this situation as either healthy or alarming--"healthy" in that new options are needed, or "alarming" in that scope and sequence of common learning (i.e., general education) have apparently been largely abandonned. (Taylor and Haas 1973, p. 10)

This situation still seems to prevail in 1976. If any changes have occurred in the last three or four years, they have probably been in one or more of these directions: (1) toward a return to more history, especially the narrative, expository approach prevalent in the 1950s; (2) toward greater emphasis on academic skills, especially reading; (3) toward a reduction of funds for the purchase of social studies materials; (4) toward a more vocational emphasis in social studies, especially in career education programs; (5) toward a proliferation of new courses and units, especially those having student appeal and teacher interest, and in such areas as values/moral education, global issues, and future studies; (6) toward more out-of-school, community-based activities, such as practicum and internships; (7) toward the use of classroom materials and activities with greater student appeal and involvement, such as games and simulations;

and (8) toward less time for social studies and science in the elementary school, with a corresponding increase in time for reading and mathematics.

It appears that social studies education today lacks secure moorings, and is wandering in search of focus. Perhaps a renewal of dialogue and debate concerning definition, scope and sequence is now needed as an impetus for social studies educators to rediscover and reclarify their positions.

The last weak rays of light are still barely visible in the night sky, from the tail of the now vanished comet that was the era of the "new social studies." Within the ken of this observer, there are no new comets today of sufficient intensity to reveal their paths or directions. Social studies education appears unillumined in an educational sky filled with faint comets from yesteryear.

References

merican Council of Learned Societies/National Council for the Social Studies (ACLS/NCSS). *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences.* New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Allen, Jack. "Assessing Recent Developments in the Social Studies." *Social Education,* 31:2 (February 1967) 99-103.

Allen, Rodney F., John V. Fleckenstein, and Peter M. Lyon, eds. *Inquiry in the Social Studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

An Analysis of New Mathematics Programs. Washington, DC: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1963. ED 036 427.

Barr, Robert D., ed. *Values and Youth.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971. ED 055 008.

Becker, James M. "Prospect for Change in the Social Studies." *Social Education,* 29:1 (January 1965) 20.

Bellack, Arno. "Structure in the Social Sciences and Implications for the Social Studies Program." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future,* G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

Berelson, Bernard. "Introduction." In *The Social Studies and the Social Science,* American Council of Learned Societies/National Council for the Social Studies (ACLS/NCSS). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Bestor, Authur E., Jr. *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

_____. *The Restoration of Learning.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Bruner, Jerome. *On Knowing.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

_____. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

_____. "The Process of Education Revisited." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 53:1 (September 1971) 19.

Bush, Douglas. "Education for All Is Education for None." *The New York Times Magazine* (January 9, 1955).

"Centers Established in 1964: A Brief Report." *Social Education,* 29:4 (April 1965) 224-25.

Clements, Millard H., William R. Fielder, and Robert Tabachnick. *Social Study: Inquiry in Elementary Classrooms*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966. ED 052 092.

Conant, James Bryant. *The American High School Today*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Crown, Bonnie R. "Voices from Asia." *Social Education*, 33:7 (November 1969) 802, 837.

Dante, Harris L. "The Kent State Tragedy: Lessons for Teachers." *Social Education*, 35:4 (April 1971) 358.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*, New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1916.

_____. *Experience and Education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1939.

_____. *How We Think*. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath, 1910.

Directory of Social Studies Curriculum Projects. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1969. ED 041 814.

"A Directory of Social Studies Projects: United States Office of Education Social Studies Program in Research." *Social Education*, 31:6 (October 1967) 509-510.

Engle, Shirley H. "Decision Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction." *Social Education*, 24:7 (November 1960) 301-304, 306.

_____. "Thoughts in Regard to Revision." *Social Education*, 27:4 (April 1963) 182-84, 196.

Edgerton, Stephenie G. "'Learning' by Induction." *Social Education*, 31:5 (May 1967) 376.

Fenton, Edwin, ed. *Experimental Units: Government at Stoerpenberg Camp, An Introduction to the Study of History*, and *Our Colonial Ancestors*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967(a).

_____. "History in the New Social Studies." *Social Education*, 30:5 (May 1966) 325-8.

_____. *The New Social Studies*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967(b).

_____. *32 Problems in World History*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1964.

_____. *Teaching the New Social Studies: An Inductive Approach*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Fenton, Edwin, and John M. Good. "Project Social Studies: A Progress Report." *Social Education*, 29:4 (April 1965) 206.

Flesch, Rudolf. *Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It*. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1955.

Foshay, Arthur W. "How Fare the Disciplines?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 51:7 (March 1970) 352.

Gallagher, James. *An Annotated Bibliography of Anthropological Materials for High School Use*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1967.

Gardner, John W. "Foreword," In *The American High School Today*, James Bryant Conant. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Gibson, John S. *New Frontiers in the Social Studies, Vol. I, Goals for Students, Means for Teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Citation Press, 1967(a).

_____. *New Frontiers in the Social Studies, Vol. II, Action and Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Citation Press, 1967(b).

Goodlad, John I. "Curriculum: A Janus Look." *Teachers College Record*, 70:2 (November 1968) 105.

Haas, John D. "Whither the Social Studies?" *The Social Studies*, 58:2 (February 1967) 59.

Haley, Frances. "Introduction to Project Materials Analyses." *Social Education*, 36:7 (November 1972) 718-9.

Halsey, Van R., Jr. "American History: A New High School Course." *Social Education*, 27:5 (May 1963) 249-252.

Halsey, Van R., and Richard H. Brown, eds. *New Dimensions in American History* (9 volumes). Boston, MA: D.C. Heath, 1964-65.

Hanna, Paul R. "Revising the Social Studies: What Is Needed?" *Social Education*, 27:4 (April 1963) 190-96.

_____. "The Social Studies Program in the Elementary School in the Twentieth Century." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future*, G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

Hanvey, Robert. *The Idea of Liberty in American Culture*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1967.

Hebert, Louis J., and William Murphy, eds. *Structure in the Social Studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1968.

Hertzberg, Hazel. *The Great Tree and the Longhouse: The Culture of the Iroquois.* New York, NY: Macmillan, 1967.

Hullfish, H. Gordon, and Philip G. Smith. *Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education.* New York, NY: Dodd, Mead, 1961.

Hunt, Erling M., et al. *High School Social Studies Perspectives.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Hunt, Maurice P., and Lawrence E. Metcalf. *Teaching High School Social Studies.* New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1955 (1st ed.), 1968 (2nd ed.).

Jarolimek, John. "The Taxonomy: Guide to Differentiated Instruction." *Social Education,* 26:8 (December 1962) 445-47.

Jewett, Robert E., and Robert B. Ribble. "Curriculum Improvement and Teacher Status." *Social Education,* 31:1 (January 1967) 20.

Johnson, Earl S. "A View of the Future of the Social Studies." In *New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences,* 28th Yearbook. Roy A. Price, ed. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1958.

Jones, Phillip S., and Authur F. Coxford, Jr. "Mathematics in the Evolving School," In *A History of Mathematics Education in the United States and Canada.* Washington, DC: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1970.

Keller, Charles R. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies." *Saturday Review* (September 16, 1961).

Kownslar, Allan O., and Donald B. Frizzle. *Discovering American History.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Krug, Mark M. "Bruner's New Social Studies: A Critique." *Social Education,* 30:6 (October 1966) 400-406.

Lockard, J. David, ed. *Science and Mathematics Curricular Developments Internationally, 1956-1974.* College Park, MD: Commission on Science Education of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and The Science Teaching Center of the University of Maryland, 1975. ED 106 112.

Lynd, Albert. *Quackery in the Public Schools.* New York, NY: Grosset and Dunlap, 1953.

Macdonald, James B. "Curriculum Development in Relation to Social and Intellectual Systems." In *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect,* 70th Yearbook. Robert M. McClure, ed. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education and University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Marker, Gerald W. "Conclusion." In *Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials,* by Carole L. Hahn, Gerald W. Marker, Thomas J. Switzer, and Mary Jane Turner, Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, forthcoming 1977.

Marriot, Alice. *The Kiowas: Profile of a People.* New York, NY: Macmillan, 1967.

_____. *Kiowa Years: A Study in Culture Impact.* New York, NY: Macmillan, 1968.

Massialas, Byron G. "Revising the Social Studies: An Inquiry-Centered Approach." *Social Education,* 27:4 (April 1963) 185-89.

Massialas, Byron G., and C. Benjamin Cox. *Inquiry in Social Studies.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Mayer, Martin. *Social Studies in American Schools.* New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1962.

McAulay, J.D. "Using the Historical Method in the Elementary School." *Social Education,* 25:5 (May 1961) 247-49.

McClure, Robert M. "The Reforms of the Fifties and Sixties: A Historical Look at the Near Past." In *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect,* 70th Yearbook. Robert M. McClure, ed. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education, 1971.

Mendenhall, Thomas C. "Social Studies, History, and the Secondary School." *Social Education,* 27:4 (April 1963) 202-204.

Metcalf, Lawrence E. "Some Guidelines for Changing Social Studies Education." *Social Education,* 27:4 (April 1963) 197-201.

_____, ed. *Values Education: Rationale, Strategies and Procedures.* 41st Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971. ED 055 007.

Michaelis, John U. "A Review of New Curriculum Developments and Projects." In *The Social Sciences: Foundations of the Social Studies.* John U. Michaelis and A. Montgomery, eds. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

_____. "Social Studies Project Reports and Other Publications." *Social Education,* 29:4 (April 1965) 206-227.

"Minutes: 13th Delegate Assembly, NCSS House of Delegates." *Social Education,* 34:4 (April 1970) 471.

"More About Project Social Studies." *Social Education,* 26:7 (November 1962) 411.

Morrissett, Irving, ed. *Concepts and Structure in the New Social Science Curricula.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967. ED 014 003.

Moulton, Muriel. "Using Documents in Junior High School." *Social Education,* 26:6 (October 1962) 310-12.

NCSS Task Force on Curriculum Guidelines. "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines." *Social Education*, 35:8 (December 1971[a]) 853-869.

_____. *Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971(b). ED 055 066.

"NDEA 1968 Institutes." *Social Education*, 32:2 (February 1968) 153-56.

"New In-Depth Evaluations of Social Studies Curricular Projects, Programs, and Materials." *Social Education*, 36:7 (November 1972) 711-773.

Newmann, Fred M. "The Analysis of Public Controversy--New Focus on Social Studies." *The School Review* (Winter 1965) 414.

Newmann, Fred M. (with Donald W. Oliver). *Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1970. ED 054 033.

The New York Times Magazine (April 1, 1956).

Odegard, Peter. "The Social Sciences in the Twentieth Century." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future*, G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

Oliver, Donald, and Fred Newmann. *Public Issues Series*, 12 vols. Columbus, OH: American Education Publications, 1967.

Oliver, Donald, and James P. Shaver. *Teaching Public Issues in the High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

"Opportunities for Teachers." *Social Education*, 29:3 (March 1965) 179.

"Overview of the Project Materials Analyses." *Social Education*, 36:7 (November 1972) 720-21.

Parker, Cecil, and Louis Rubin. *Process as Content: Curriculum Design and the Application of Knowledge*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1966.

Patton, Donald J., ed. *From Geographic Discipline to Inquiring Student: Final Report on the High School Geography Project*. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers, 1970. ED 087 676.

Phenix, Philip. "Key Concepts and the Crisis in Learning." *Teachers College Record*, 58:3 (December 1956) 137-143.

_____. "The Uses of the Disciplines as Curriculum Content." *The Educational Forum*, 26:3 (March 1962) 273-74.

Platt, Myles N. "Concepts and the Curriculum." *Social Education*, 27:1 (January 1963) 21-22, 41.

Price, Roy A., ed. *Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies* (Research Bulletin No. 1). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1964.

_____, ed. *New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences.* 28th Yearbook. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1958.

Quillen, I. James. "Preface." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future,* G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

_____. "The Social Studies Program in the Secondary School in the Twentieth Century." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future,* G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

Raths, Louis E., Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. *Values and Teaching.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing, 1966.

"Reactions to the Reports on Project Social Studies." *Social Education,* 29:6 (October 1965) 356-360.

Rickover, H.G. *Education and Freedom.* New York, NY: E.P. Dutton, 1959.

Robinson, Donald W. "Ferment in the Social Studies." *Social Education* 27:7 (November 1963) 360-64, 410.

Sanders, Norris M. and Marlin L. Tanck. "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects." *Social Education,* 34:4 (April 1970) 383-449.

Schwab, Joseph. "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline." *Educational Record,* 43:3 (July 1962) 197-205.

Senesh, Lawrence. *Our Working World.* Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1964. ED 068 622.

Shaver, James P. "Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition." *Social Education,* 31:7 (November 1967) 588.

Shaver, James P., and Harold Berlak, eds. *Democracy, Pluralism and the Social Studies.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Shaver, James P., and A. Guy Larkins. *Decision-Making in a Democracy.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Shaver, James P., and Donald W. Oliver. "Teaching Students to Analyze Public Controversy: A Curriculum Project Report." *Social Education,* 28:4 (April 1964) 191-94, 248.

Sherman, Helene. *Common Elements in New Mathematics Programs: Their Origins and Evolution.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1972.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom.* New York, NY: Random House, 1970. ED 047 412.

Smith, Gerald R. "Project Social Studies--A Report." *Social Education,* 27:7 (November 1963) 357-59, 409.

Smith, Mortimer, ed. *A Decade of Comment on Education: 1956-1966.* Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1966.

_____. *The Diminished Mind.* Chicago, IL: H. Regnery, 1954.

Smith, Ronald O. "Though Time Be Fleet." *Social Education,* 34:2 (February 1970) 194.

Sowards, G. Wesley. "An Introduction." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future,* G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

State Curriculum Commission. *Social Studies Framework for the Public Schools of California.* Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, 1962.

Stavrianos, L.S. "New Viewpoints in Teaching World History." *Social Education,* 26:3 (March 1962) 129-132.

Sutherland, Neil. "Structure in the History Curriculum." *Social Education,* 26:3 (March 1962) 133-36, 140.

Taba, Hilda. "Techniques of In-Service Training." *Social Education,* 29:7 (November 1965) 464-476.

Taylor, Bob L. "Is Citizenship Education Obsolete?" *Educational Leadership,* 31:5 (February 1974) 448.

Taylor, Bob L., and John D. Haas. *New Directions: Social Studies Curriculum for the 70's.* Boulder, CO: Center for Education in the Social Sciences, University of Colorado, and Social Science Education Consortium, 1973. ED 100 784.

Todd, Lewis Paul. "Afterword: Revising the Social Studies." In *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences,* American Council of Learned Societies/ National Council for the Social Studies (ACLS/NCSS). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

_____. "Editor's Page." *Social Education,* 28:2 (February 1964) 63.

_____. "Editor's Page: The Seamless Web." *Social Education,* 27:4 (April 1963) 181, 204.

Trump, J. Lloyd. *An Exciting Profession: New Horizons for Secondary School Teachers*. Washington, DC: National Association of Secondary School Principals. 1957.

Trump, J. Lloyd, and Dorsy Baynham. *Focus on Change: Guide to Better Schools*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1963.

Tyler, Ralph. "An Assessment: The Edge of the Future." In *The Social Studies: Curriculum Proposals for the Future*, G. Wesley Sowards, ed. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1963.

Woodring, Paul. *A Fourth of a Nation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Related Readings in the ERIC System

Described below are a number of journal articles and papers related to the history of the "new social studies."

To obtain copies of the journal articles listed below (indicated by an EJ number preceding the title), readers should use their local library or contact the journal's main office.

Other documents (indicated by ED numbers) are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Microfiche (MF) or paper copy (HC) of these documents can be obtained by writing EDRS, Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. All orders must refer to the ED number and be accompanied by prepayment, including postage. Fourth-class postage for the first 60 MF or first 60 HC pages is $0.21; each additional 60 MF or pages of HC costs an additional $0.09. One MF contains 96 pages. For those documents that are only or also available through a publisher or other source, the ordering address and price is given.

If there is an ERIC microfiche collection in a nearby university library or school resource and service center, the reader might prefer to look over specific documents there before (or instead of) ordering from EDRS. To obtain a list of the locations of ERIC microfiche collections, write to User Services Program, ERIC/ChESS, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302.

Journal Articles

EJ 029 049. "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions." By James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis. *Social Education*, 34:8 (November 1970) 743-751.

This article presents to stimulate debate on "just what social studies is and ought to be" by presenting three basic definitions of *social studies:* social studies as citizenship transmission, social studies as social science, and social studies as reflective inquiry.

EJ 046 595. "A Philosophical Analysis of the 'New' Social Studies." By Joseph V. Ellis. *Social Studies*, 62:5 (October 1971) 195-203.

The author examines the notion of inquiry and the methods and strategies advocated within the "new social studies" in a historical perspective and attempts to find out how much of the "new social studies" is "in fact revolution and how much is in fact reaffirmation."

EJ 062 629. "Emerging Paradigms in the New Social Studies." By Jan L. Tucker. *Social Science Record*, 9:3 (Spring 1972) 10-19.

Paradigms developed from process and content categories are: (1) scientific, discipline centered, (2) humanistic, discipline centered, (3) scientific, practical-problem centered, and (4) humanistic, practical-problem centered. Each is examined for its logical implications for the role of the social studies teacher.

EJ 067 302. "Book Review: A Basic Library on the New Social Studies." By Jack L. Nelson. *Social Education*, 36:7 (November 1972) 811-12.

This essay presents a review of books with which the well-read social educator should be familiar, offering a body of literature that can assist in understanding different views of "new social studies" and including illuminating examples from teaching resources.

EJ 067 326. "Philosophical Analysis of the 'New' Social Studies--A Response." By Terry Northup. *Social Studies*, 63:7 (December 1972) 315-17.

In this response to EJ 046 595, described above, the author examines statements by proponents of the "new social studies" and develops a perspective including choices among goals, methods, curriculum materials, and approaches to value issues in teaching social studies.

EJ 077 091. "In Pursuit of the Elusive New Social Studies." By John Jarolimek. *Educational Leadership*, 30:7 (April 1973) 596-99.

This article presents suggestions for developing meaningful changes in social studies curriculum and reviews past social studies programs.

EJ 115 041. "Will the Real 'New Social Studies' Please Stand Up?" By Donald E. Anctil. *Social Studies Review*, 14:4 (Spring 1975) 11-15.

Barth and Shermis' definitions of social studies (see above, EJ 029 049) are examined in this article.

EJ 128 492. "The Decline of Social Studies: Changing Perspectives in Social Studies Education in the 20th Century." By George Sykes. *Social Studies*, 66:6 (November/December 1975) 243-46.

The role and content of the social studies curriculum for elementary and secondary students is examined and compared with preceding curricula of the '40s, '50s, and '60s. The premise is that today's social studies is too narrow and does not encompass enough humanistic perspective, resulting in the need for teachers to re-evaluate the social studies curriculum of today.

Documents

ED 051 066. *Historical Parallels for the Sixties and Seventies: Primary Sources and Core Curriculum Revisited.* Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, 1971. 34pp. EDRS Price: MF-$0.83; HC-$2.06 plus postage. Also available from Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302, $1.50 (order Publication #135).

Intent on alerting curriculum developers to cyclical elements in social studies trends during the last 90 years, this paper reviews the two most pervasive national movements at the secondary level: (1) the source study movement, in which students' use of primary source materials was emphasized in history instruction from the 1880s through the 1910s; and (2) the core curriculum movement in which social studies and English were most commonly combined into block-time courses for all students from the 1920s through the 1950s. These movements were selected for review because they exhibited some of the most important characteristics of the "new social studies" of the 1960s and of the social studies emerging in the 1970s. The latter reforms are considered comparable to the core curriculum just as the reforms of the 1960s are to the scientific

historiography of the source study movement. The reviews include discussions of the forces that produced, sustained, and ended them and conceptual models for classifying and comparing them to their recent and future variations. Historically, curriculum reformers gave little attention to previous movements, whether similar or not. Citing this as a dysfunctional inconsistency for the social scientists and educators who lead reform movements, the author calls for a variety of studies in social studies history. Sources cited are annotated in a six-page bibliography.

ED 102 038. *Utilization of New Social Studies Curriculum Programs.* By Mary Jane Turner and Frances Haley. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education and Social Science Education Consortium, 1975. 84pp. EDRS price: MF-$0.83; HC-$4.67 plus postage. Also available from Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302, $2.85 (order Publication #178).

This report presents and analyzes data on the extent of use of nine new secondary social studies curriculum materials in four states. These include: *American Political Behavior, Asian Studies Inquiry Series, Episodes in Social Inquiry, Geography in an Urban Age, Holt Social Studies Curriculum, Justice in Urban America, Patterns in Human History, Public Issues Series,* and *Units in American History.* The study also examined selected characteristics of users, their perceptions about the effectiveness of the products, and comparisons with other social studies materials. Nine hundred and eighty teachers in California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Texas responded to the 15-page questionnaire. Findings show that only 42 percent of the teachers use the materials, with the highest percentage coming from Connecticut and the lowest from Texas. The *Holt Social Studies Curriculum* is the most widely used, while *Patterns in Human History* is the least. Teacher characteristics affecting utilization include holding a permanent contract, professional status, membership in professional organizations, and location of school. The users have overwhelmingly positive opinions about the effectiveness of the new materials.

ED 113 245. *The "New Social Studies" Is Plural.* Publication No. 6. Greensboro, NC: North Carolina University, Humanistic Education Project, 1974. 13pp. EDRS Price: MF-$0.83; HC-$1.67 plus postage.

The writings of 33 authors in curriculum theory and social studies are analyzed to determine whether each author supports structure-discovery views, reflective-inquiry views, or expresses views that tend to reflect both positions or neither position regarding the new approaches to teaching social studies. The structure-discovery method is designed to teach substantive concepts and procedures from the knowledge structure of a specific discipline. Students, through problem solving, hypothesis testing, or some other involvement, determine the concepts or generalizations for themselves. The reflective-inquiry method is designed to develop each student's ability to make decisions about personal and societal problems. The "content" to be studied is not predetermined but is comprised of data needed to investigate the problem and make decisions about it. Reflective-inquiry emphasizes student value analysis, reflection, and classification in order to make a decision on a specific societal problem. Thirteen writers in the sample favor the structure-discovery approach; twelve favor the reflective-inquiry approach; while eight are inconsistent between the two approaches. Although some of the authors' views may have changed since completion of the study in 1971 and more materials have been written recently, the descriptions of positions can help teachers to conceptualize social studies teaching alternatives.

The items above were identified through a computer search of the ERIC data base. In the first phase of the search, we requested all items that were indexed under both of two descriptors--*Educational History* and *Social Studies*. In the second phase, we requested all items that combined the words *new*, *social*, and *studies* in their titles. Both *Current Index to Journals in Education* (CIJE) and *Resources in Education* (RIE) were searched on December 6, 1976. Only selected items from this search, which printed out approximately 75 items, were included. Readers wishing to obtain the full list of items or to obtain a computer search update of the list containing items put into ERIC since December 1976 should contact the User Services Program of ERIC/ChESS, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302.